

District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6712. A bill to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6713. A bill to authorize a further preliminary examination and a new survey of the Spring Creek, North and South Branches, which flows into the Marsh River, a tributary of the Red River of the North, Norman County, State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6714. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6715. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 to include the State of Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS (by request):

H. R. 6716. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 6717. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of the reclamation fund for the cost of the construction and certain costs of operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system adjacent to the Yuma Federal Irrigation project in Arizona and California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution to suspend commercial relations with Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution suspending commercial relations between the United States and Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRN of New York:

H. R. 6718. A bill for the relief of Jephtha R. Macfarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 6719. A bill for the relief of Manuel Barrios, his wife, Elvira Barrios, and infant son, Gerardo Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6720. A bill for the relief of Fe'R. Dumaguing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 6721. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6722. A bill to authorize the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to hear and determine a motion for a new trial for Thomas Jordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2017. By Mr. HART: Petition of Union City Post, No. 46, of the American Legion, protesting further shipment of potential war

materials to the Soviet Union and its satellite nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2018. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of the German Sick Beneficial Society of Mansfield, Ohio, with reference to the amendment of House bill 6163; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2019. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Wirt Henry Ferguson urging Congress to establish a policy to halt aggressive expansion of the present Russian Government and its satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2020. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Frank Kish and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2021. Also, petition of Micheal T. Nevaloney and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation which would provide for the admission of our share of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2022. Also, petition of Glendale American Legion Post, No. 127, California, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of legislation for increase in compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 20, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, as Thou dost move among people and see what men are doing today, how sore must be Thy heart.

Thou whose head was cradled in straw must often reflect that straw was not as coarse as man's selfishness.

Thou whose hands were spread upon a cross and fastened with nails must often reflect that nails were never so sharp as man's ingratitude.

Hear us as we pray for this poor blundering world, in which the nations never seem to learn how to live as brothers.

They resort again and again to methods that produce only more bitter tears, methods that only add to misery and subtract nothing from problems.

Heal them that need healing, make strong the wavering, guide the perplexed, befriend the lonely, give new faith and courage to those whose spirits are low.

Lift up our heads, put a new light in our eyes and a new song in our hearts, and we will do better and be better for the sake of Thy love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, May 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced

that on May 26, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 1979. An act authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell and hard-shell clams.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6407) to encourage the development of an international air-transportation system adapted to the needs of the foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. LEA, and Mr. PRIEST were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5874) to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6071) to provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6096. An act making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Neb., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore;

H. R. 3731. An act authorizing modifications in the repayment contracts with the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 1 and the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation District No. 2;

H. R. 3785. An act to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5874. An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

(The following request by Mr. FERGUSON was inadvertently omitted from the RECORD of Wednesday, May 26, 1948:)

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Corporations of the Committee

on Appropriations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate until the completion of the hearings on the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is entered.

MURDER OF GEORGE W. POLK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD copy of a letter which I have sent to the Secretary of State regarding the shocking murder of George W. Polk, chief correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System in the Middle East, whose body was found, bound hand and foot, floating in the bay at Salonika in Greece.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 22, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This week the body of George W. Polk, chief correspondent for the Columbia Broadcasting System in the Middle East, was found, bound hand and foot, floating in the bay at Salonika in Greece. According to newspaper accounts, he had been shot in the back of the head.

You will agree with me, I believe, that it is of the utmost importance that the American people be acquainted with all of the facts in this tragic case, and it is to that end that I send you this letter.

In addition to an investigation and disclosure of the facts, I should like to know precisely what steps the State Department is taking in this matter. Is an official inquiry under way to determine and fix responsibility for this reporter's death? Is the Government of Greece cooperating in this inquiry? Has it been determined that Mr. Polk's death was due to the negligence of the Greek Government? If so, is the Greek Government prepared to take appropriate action?

I hope that you will give this matter your personal attention and that I may expect to have a report at the earliest possible time.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as part of this insertion, I ask that there be printed a resolution adopted by the executive committee of Overseas Writers, and a press release which was issued by Mr. Walter Lippmann, chairman of the committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk, and by Ernest K. Lindley, president of the Overseas Writers, together with a list of the names of the members of the committee appointed to inquire into the murder of George Polk.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution by the executive committee of Overseas Writers appointing a committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk

Whereas the murder of George Polk while carrying out his duties as an American reporter in a foreign country is of grave concern to American writers;

Resolved, That a committee appointed by the president of Overseas Writers is directed to determine whether a full and complete inquiry into all the circumstances of the crime is being conducted;

And is therefore authorized to call upon the Secretary of State, the Ambassador of Greece, and the Chief of the American Mis-

sion for Aid to Greece, Governor Dwight Griswold;

And is also directed to receive evidence submitted from any other sources;

And when this preliminary inquiry has been completed, the committee is directed to report to the president and the executive committee of Overseas Writers whether other measures are necessary to uncover the whole truth.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY WALTER LIPPMANN, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE MURDER OF GEORGE POLK, AND BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY, PRESIDENT, OVERSEAS WRITERS

Gen. William J. Donovan, organizer and director of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, has consented to serve as counsel to the committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk.

Statement by Mr. Lippmann: "The committee feels that General Donovan's acceptance of this invitation will give the American public in general and the newspaper, radio, and magazine professions confidence that the inquiry will be thorough and penetrating. It goes without saying, I hope, that General Donovan, like the members of the committee, is serving without compensation."

The committee to inquire into the murder of George Polk was appointed by authority of a resolution of the executive committee of Overseas Writers. It is directed to determine whether a full and complete inquiry into all the circumstances of the crime is being conducted, to receive evidence from official and private sources, and to report . . . whether other measures are necessary to uncover the whole truth.

A list of the members of the committee is attached.

COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE MURDER OF GEORGE POLK

Walter Lippmann, columnist, New York Herald Tribune Syndicate, chairman.

Marquis Childs, columnist, United Features Syndicate, vice chairman.

Pheips Adams, chief, Washington bureau, New York Sun.

Morgan Beatty, commentator, National Broadcasting Co.

Elmer Davis, commentator, American Broadcasting Co.

Peter Edson, columnist, Newspaper Enterprise Association.

Robert Elson, chief, Washington bureau, Time and Life.

Benjamin M. McKelway, editor, Washington Evening Star.

Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board, Washington Post.

Reiman Morin, chief, Washington bureau, Associated Press.

James Reston, New York Times.

Albert L. Warner, chief, Washington news bureau, Mutual Broadcasting System.

Lyle C. Wilson, chief, Washington bureau, United Press.

Ex officio

Ernest K. Lindley, Washington editor, Newsweek; president of Overseas Writers.

Joseph C. Harsch, news analyst, Columbia Broadcasting System; secretary of Overseas Writers.

Paul Wooton, New Orleans Times-Picayune; treasurer of Overseas Writers.

REPORT OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(For text of President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6598.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 161)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Justice in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF SUBMARINE CHASER TO VALLEY FORGE MILITARY ACADEMY FOUNDATION, WAYNE, PA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Valley Forge Military Academy Foundation, of Wayne, Pa., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a submarine chaser for use by that organization for student training purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTRACT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND INDIANS OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a contract by and between the United States and the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 1 year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Montana Stock Growers' Association, at Bozeman, Mont., favoring the enactment of legislation giving that association a voice in wage controversies under the Railway Labor Act, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5965. A bill to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421); and

H. R. 6242. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2186. A bill to amend section 5 of the Act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1415).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 6078. A bill to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2675. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1418):

H. R. 5587. A bill to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417):

H. R. 5816. A bill to amend the act of April 25, 1947, relating to the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1419); and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam; with amendments (Rept. No. 1420).

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Charles Franklin Brannan, of Colorado, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Robert L. Shivers, of Honolulu, T. H., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H. (reappointment).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert C. Burns, to be a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Marine Corps; William E. Bonds to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps, and Edward R. Carney and sundry other officers to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps;

Augustine A. Albanese, and sundry others for appointment in the Navy; and

John H. Dayton and sundry other retired officers for advancement on the retired list of the Navy to the rank of vice admiral.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama; and

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of April 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
May 13, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1948, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, \$5,905.20.

Fedele F. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW.; Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, \$9,975.

Martha D. Ring, 3510 Morrison Street NW.; Division of Public Health Methods, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, \$6,623.40.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REED:

S. 2757. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECTON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. McFARLAND):

S. 2758. A bill to stimulate the production and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2759. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a post office building at Bunker Hill, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2760. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes;

S. 2761. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

S. 2762. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Air Engineering Development Center, and for other purposes; and

S. 2763. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2764. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 2765, to amend the Public Health Service Act, 79th Cong., ch. 538, 2d sess., to provide for Federal inspection of institutions, State mental health authorities, and hospitals who obtain grants of money, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6096. An act making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Musca-

tine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6659. An act to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SOCIAL SECURITY RELATING TO PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY INSURANCE (S. DOC. NO. 162)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I present a report of the Advisory Council on Social Security, relating to permanent and total disability insurance made to the Senate Committee on Finance, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding Senate Joint Resolution 200, together with a copy of the joint resolution, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ADDRESS TO TEXANS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Fort Worth, Tex., on May 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIVING: 1948—ADDRESS BY GOV. EARL WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Living—1948, delivered by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, on May 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—EDITORIAL FROM THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of statehood for Hawaii, published in the Honolulu Advertiser, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate this afternoon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. IVES asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to sit this afternoon for the purpose of holding a hearing.

Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Foreign Relations to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee investigating

the shortage of oil and petroleum products to sit and hold a hearing during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Oil and Steel of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business to sit during the session of the Senate today.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Millikin
Baldwin	Green	Moore
Barkley	Gurney	Morse
Brewster	Hatch	Murray
Bricker	Hawkes	O'Connor
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Buck	Hill	Reed
Butler	Holland	Revercomb
Byrd	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworschak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	White
Feazel	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Wilson
Fulbright	Maybank	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION OF VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAMS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution. I ask for immediate consideration, that the clerk read the resolution, and that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair assumes that the Senator is not asking for immediate consideration in the Senate of the resolution itself, but is asking for immediate consideration of its reference.

Mr. CAPEHART. Reference to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 245) was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Whereas the attention of the Senate has been called to certain allegations against the radio-broadcast operations of the State Department and certain radio networks under Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, commonly known as the Voice of America program; and

Whereas these allegations, if true, present a condition so critical in our interstate and foreign communications as to warrant the immediate attention of this body: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby gives unanimous approval to a full and complete investigation of these allegations by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1949: *Provided, however*, That the committee shall file an interim report of the findings of its preliminary investigation, together with its recommendations for any immediate legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate on or before June 15, 1948.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be given immediate consideration by the Senate when so requested by said committee in an amount sufficient to carry out the purpose of this resolution, which expenses shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if unanimous consent is being asked for consideration of the resolution, I shall have to interpose objection. I think it ought to be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Indiana is not asking for immediate consideration by the Senate of the resolution. He is asking immediate consideration of the question of reference of his resolution to a committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to ask immediate consideration. That is always in the province of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Chair will have to state that under objection any consideration of the resolution—even the question of reference—would have to lie over for 1 day, without unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to the investigation. Of course I support it. But it is rather odd to submit a resolution announcing that the Senate does anything unanimously, in advance of action. Presuming on the unanimity of the Senate is a little out of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must state that debate is not in order, under the Reorganization Act, on a question of this character. The only question before the Senate is whether it will give unanimous consent for the present reference of the resolution to a committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If unanimous consent is given, does that foreclose the right of any Senator to object to the reference?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If unanimous consent is given, under the terms of the Reorganization Act the Chair is required to make an immediate reference, without debate. But the reference is subject to an appeal, which is debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no idea that the Chair would make an erroneous reference of the resolution. Therefore I do not wish to be in the position of objecting to the Chair passing on the question. But I have very definite conclusions and opinions as to where the resolution should go.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none.

This is another of those very difficult situations which arise under the language of the Reorganization Act. In this instance at least three committees of the Senate could certainly sustain a color of right to consider the resolution. One of them is the Committee on Foreign Relations. Another is the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The third is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the presence of such a controversy the Chair is required to act under section 137 of the Reorganization Act, which reads as follows:

In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

As has happened in a number of previous instances this session, the Chair

confronts the necessity of deciding in his own mind which committee has jurisdiction over "the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation." Therefore the problem is, What interest predominates as between the three rival committees?

In the present instance the Chair feels that the line of demarcation between at least two of these committees is very narrow. Therefore the Chair proposes, insofar as the rules permit, to submit the question of jurisdiction to the decision of the Senate itself.

Unfortunately, under the Reorganization Act, which in this respect is quite contrary to the previous rules of the Senate, the only way the Chair can submit the question to the Senate is to make a tentative reference in the first instance and then invite an appeal if the Senate disagrees with the reference. Therefore, solely for the purpose of initiating the process of permitting the Senate to decide, the Chair will make a tentative reference, which will be made without prejudice, and with the distinct understanding that so far as the Chair is concerned, he is merely embracing a mechanism for the purpose of allowing a free decision in the Senate.

The Chair finds that the interest of the Committee on Foreign Relations is not the predominating interest in this legislation, for what the Chair believes are obvious reasons. There is a more direct and specific predominance, in the Chair's view, in another committee.

In the view of the Chair, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does not predominate, because in the tentative opinion of the Chair the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could arise only in respect to that committee's jurisdiction over radio; and it does not seem to the Chair that the radio phase, per se, of the pending problem predominates.

The Chair therefore tentatively rules that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, because under the Reorganization Act to that committee is committed the specific obligation of "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Therefore, if the Senate will have in mind what the Chair has said by way of introduction, namely, that this is purely a mechanism for the purpose of letting the Senate itself decide—the Chair rules, without prejudice to anyone or to any committee, that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That ruling is subject to appeal, and an appeal is subject to debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, tentatively I appeal—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor; have I not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from Kentucky was recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, I feel that the Chair has rendered his decision in good faith. Yet I feel that the criticism which was indulged in and will be indulged in regarding this whole matter is and will be leveled against the State Department because of legislation which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senate is familiar with the course of that legislation over the last year, and the Senate is familiar with the fact that it was regarded as being of such importance that a joint committee of the two Houses was appointed and authorized to investigate the question of the Voice of America. It made a very detailed investigation in a number of countries, and came back here and proposed legislation was formulated in the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee reported the proposed legislation, and it was enacted. So this whole matter involves a law and the administration of a law by the State Department, and that law came from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I understand that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have over-all jurisdiction to investigate expenditures in all departments, regardless of the particular committee from which the legislation upon which the investigation is based may have emanated. Yet it seems to me that the committee which sponsored this program, which heard the witnesses who testified concerning it and which advocated the legislation, and in a sense is responsible for it, should make the investigation of any violation or any omission or any item of performance of the program by the Department, which certainly relies upon the Committee on Foreign Relations for legislation of this and all other kinds dealing with our foreign relations and our international program.

I have no doubt that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments would conduct a fair and impartial investigation. Yet, under the circumstances, I feel that this resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I realize that committee has a very large program, and probably in some respects it is overworked. It may be that the committee does not desire to have jurisdiction of this matter. I rather suspect that it does not. Nevertheless, it seems to me somewhat strange that the investigation should be taken away from that committee, because I have a feeling that if the same sort of investigation were to be carried on under a resolution by which the RFC or the Export-Import Bank or the Commodity Credit Corporation were to be investigated, the investigation would go to the committee which was responsible for the original legislation, because, in this instance, if legislation on this subject is necessary, it is bound to come from the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive De-

partments cannot bring in a bill or any other proposed legislation dealing with the Voice of America and its program, which is a part of our international set-up.

So it seems to me that the Committee on Foreign Relations should have jurisdiction of this investigation, not because it will favor the State Department, or will be unfavorable to it, because I assume that any committee would wish to know the facts; certainly I wish to know them, I wish to know how all this happened, how it came about, who was responsible, whether it was the State Department or whether it was someone in the State Department, whether it was the officers of the National Broadcasting Co. or of any other broadcasting company. We wish to know the facts; we wish to obtain the truth about this matter.

I think the committee which sponsored the program and brought in the proposed legislation, and which therefore to some extent is subject to any criticism which may grow out of a lack of foresight in the proper framing of this legislation, should not be denied the opportunity to make the investigation.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I was tentatively appealing from the decision of the Chair. However, I shall not insist on the appeal. I wished to express my views about the matter, namely, that I think the Chair should have referred this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, for obvious reasons. Nevertheless, I shall not appeal from the decision the Chair has rendered.

However, I hope this reference will not be regarded as a precedent in connection with the reference of resolutions of this sort, so as to result in having them taken away from the committees which are responsible for the legislation and for the creation of the agency that is under attack.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Naturally, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I appreciate the remarks the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has made; and having been a member of that committee, and having been chairman of the subcommittee which had to do with this legislation, and having been chairman of the group which went abroad last summer in connection with the legislation, I naturally feel very intimately connected with it. But for that very reason, so far as I personally am concerned, I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that I support the position and decision of the Chair in making the reference of this resolution, because I think it would be a splendid thing to have another committee make a fresh start on this matter.

In the Foreign Relations Committee we have given a great deal of time and thought to this matter and this program. I should like to cooperate in every way I can with another committee in this connection, because of my background of knowledge of this matter. As I have said, I think it would be wise to

have the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments look into this matter, which the Foreign Relations Committee has worked on previously.

I appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said about possibly the natural jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations; but this matter is of such concern to every Member of the Senate and to the country at large that I personally should like to have an investigation made by a new group, in view of the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee has considered the matter from a slightly different angle.

I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he thinks that would be a wise decision from the standpoint of our committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have withdrawn the appeal, which I had to take in order to be able to say what I have said about the matter. But I wish to say that I have not the slightest suspicion or fear that because the Committee on Foreign Relations sponsored this legislation in the first place, it would in any way be partial to or disposed to favor the State Department or anyone in it who had been guilty of any wrong doing or of any lack of appreciation of the problem thus faced. It may be that as a matter of general desirability, some other committee might be looked upon as likely to be a little more impartial than the Committee on Foreign Relations would be, but I do not think that is so.

However, having withdrawn the appeal, there is nothing further that I wish to say about it. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, and I know how earnest and how diligent and how utterly disinterested he has been in his efforts to bring about the enactment of this law and to see that it is properly enforced. All of us are interested in that.

I have no doubt that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, who now is presiding over the Senate, is equally interested in seeing that this law is properly administered, so that there will be no reflection upon our country or any part of it or upon our program because of it. So I withdraw the appeal. But I did not want the opportunity to pass without saying that I still have faith in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to add my own word, that I of course have faith in my own committee, and that because of my personal relationship to this subject, I am eager for some committee to check up on the matter. We shall try to cooperate with them to the end of bringing about a right result.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not wish to violate the proprieties by engaging in a discussion of the subject while in the Chair, but he would at least like permission to state that he shares with the Senator from Kentucky complete respect for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There is no disrespect involved in the Chair's decision.

The Chair wants to call to the attention of the Senate for its information

the fact that the resolution in itself, by its text, requires the investigation to be made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to say first of all I very regretfully enter my appeal from the decision of the Chair on this matter, and I wish to say a very brief word about the situation. That word must be brief, because I have only known of the situation in the late minutes, and I have had no opportunity to refresh my recollection as to events or to study the present conditions and circumstances.

I appreciate fully, Mr. President, it often happens that jurisdiction overlaps and that the Chair might well be justified in making an assignment to any one of the three committees claiming jurisdiction. There is something of truth in the statement that that is the present situation.

I feel, however, that the claim of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate is the paramount problem involved. We are dealing with a subject matter, to be sure, that has some special significance to those interested in our foreign relations, but after all, Mr. President, all that is being done by way of investigation, all that will be done by way of investigation, is to make first of all, above all else, a study of the frequencies and the other means of communication to which the State Department asserts a right and in which it indulges.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to do as we have been doing without infringing or impinging upon the use of radio frequencies by many users in this country. There are already a number of companies engaged in foreign broadcasting of news of one sort and another. They are struggling all the while for frequencies to use in their operations. The State Department is doing the same thing. I do not have before me nor in my mind at the moment the extent to which the Foreign Service of the United States, the Department of State, utilizes broadcast frequencies in connection with this work. That, it seems to me, becomes first of all the great problem. It is not a question of how much money was spent by this committee or that committee; that is a trivial consequence when we consider the other questions involved. The real basic problem is the use of communication facilities, facilities by wire and facilities by air. In any investigation that is made those are the subjects which will engage the attention of a committee, if the committee has the jurisdiction which it ought to have and must have if it is to make a study of that character.

Mr. President, this morning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce authorized a complete investigation of all phases of the situation, including in particular the extent to which radio facilities may be used or ought to be used by the State Department instead of being utilized by other agencies of news transmission. We face that, I believe, as the great problem involved here. When all the investigating is concluded, it will be found, Mr. President, that the most difficult question to solve is the question of the use of radio frequencies and radio facilities. From time immemorial

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had jurisdiction over those matters and over all the agencies of transmission.

Reference has been made to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations acted on the original bill. It was not a unanimous vote because I happened to have very definite feelings about it and voted against the report of the bill which came from the Foreign Relations Committee.

To those who may be interested, I venture the assertion that the difficulties which were disclosed as of yesterday on this floor are but the beginning of problems and difficulties, almost insurmountable in character, involving the policy of the United States and the tradition of the United States. I say those are all going to be involved unless we find out just what frequencies are being used, who is using them, for what purposes they are being used, and what advantages are accruing to the United States from their use.

Mr. President, I have rambled, but I feel very strongly that I ought to urge the appeal, both because I am so directed by members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and above all because I believe this is a matter which should go to that committee which has, and always has had, jurisdiction over communication facilities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine appeals the decision of the Chair. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAPEHART. If we now take a vote on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, then, will a motion be in order to refer the resolution to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not. If the decision of the Chair is not sustained, the Chair will make a rereference, choosing between the two remaining committees. Again, an appeal may be taken, if the Senate is not satisfied.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I was present yesterday when the debate on this subject took place, and it was suggested then that such a resolution would be submitted, but I thought the Senator from Indiana agreed it should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I made the suggestion yesterday that I would offer a resolution today referring the questions involved to the Foreign Relations Committee for investigation. However, in the interim it developed that the matter had been tentatively referred, or might be referred, or that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had taken jurisdiction and might proceed to make the investigation. Even before I had an opportunity to submit the resolution, which I stated yesterday I would offer, that situation devel-

oped. Inasmuch as the present occupant of the chair, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has ruled that he does not think the Foreign Relations Committee should handle the resolution, in my opinion, it should be handled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which committee has jurisdiction over all radio and broadcasting matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. This, Mr. President, is not a matter of technical transmission by way of radio. It is not a question involving engineering and things of that sort. The question here is a matter of national or international policy. That is why it was raised. It affects the attitude of foreign governments toward the United States by reason of their sources of information being poisoned by the slanderous and libelous reports going out over the radio. The situation would be the same if they went out by newspaper. It is the matter of high international policy, and it seems to me the only proper place for the resolution to go is to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

That committee had jurisdiction of and acted upon the original resolution or statute, as the case may be, which authorized this service. From time to time the attention of that committee is being called to this particular service. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is a committee having jurisdiction of general expenditures. This matter is a specific national and international problem which cannot be properly dealt with, as I see it, except by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has jurisdiction of all our external relations and problems.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have information to the effect that the State Department is maintaining that the responsibility lies with the broadcasting companies. I hold in my hand—

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say that it rests with the broadcasting companies by warrant of the State Department's action in making contracts with the broadcasting company. So the State Department cannot wash its hands of responsibility.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator will yield further, I hold in my hand a volume of the hearings on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1948, and from page 1031 thereof I shall read a portion of the purported contract which the State Department made with the Columbia Broadcasting System. In my opinion, it indicates very definitely that the matter belongs to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because the contract places the responsibility upon that committee. The portion to which I refer reads as follows:

The Department shall provide the contractor with general directives for each program to be prepared, produced, presented, transmitted, or broadcast by the contractor hereunder, indicating the general character of the programs and designating whether dramatic, music, news, etc., fixing the length of the programs, and the hour or hours, and the day or days of transmission.

When such directives have been delivered to the contractor, the contractor, subject to the limitations expressed herein, shall assume full responsibility for complying with them and shall exercise complete authority over such preparation, production, presentation, transmission, and broadcast within the framework of such directives.

I do not know whether that is the contract which the State Department has with the broadcasting company. If it is, then the resolution should be referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee rather than to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is not a question of dollars and cents. It is not a technical question involving kilocycles and other kinds of cycles going out over the radio. That is technical. This is a matter of high international importance, and the Committee on Foreign Relations is the proper agency to look into it, because it is responsible, in a way, for the proper conduct of the service.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it the Senator's position that it belongs with the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I want to express my concurrence with the views of the Senator from Texas that there is a very strong case to be made out for the reference of the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. Today it cleared with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which considered the matter this morning at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is a member of the committee, and the committee unanimously voted that the chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITE] should confer with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations regarding the matter before our committee took any further action. We authorized the appointment of a subcommittee to go into it, but recognized the very great claim which the Committee on Foreign Relations could make on the ground that the Senator from Texas has so well presented. Is it not clear, if the other position be taken, that because the expenditure of money is involved, which is clearly the case, therefore the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should proceed, there is not a single subject of any character concerned with any spending which that committee could not claim jurisdiction of under the theory which is advanced? The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is concerned with economy and efficiency, which words obviously emphasize the committee's concern over extravagance and waste, which is involved here, but which is no more involved than it is involved in every item of expense. Meanwhile, the question of foreign relations involves the question of broadcasting. There have been various rulings which have looked in that direction.

I am certainly happy to associate myself with the Senator from Texas in feeling that the ruling of the Chair in the

first instance should not be sustained. Following that, the question of jurisdiction between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be properly considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Maine for his agreement with the views which the Senator from Texas has undertaken to present. If jurisdiction of the measure should be given to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments because the expenditure of money is involved, then every resolution affecting any department of the Government would have to go to that committee, because there is no activity that does not require money. Everything we appropriate for involves money. Therefore if a resolution on any subject within the Federal jurisdiction comes before the Senate, some wise Senator may adjust his glasses and say, "This matter ought to go to the Committee on Expenditures, because there is an expenditure involved."

I have the highest respect for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I do not want in any wise to criticize his sincerity, but I am wondering if some little feeling of modesty as chairman of that committee might not have unconsciously influenced him in referring the resolution to some other committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I call the Senator's attention to the language of the Reorganization Act, page 23, which seems to me to be very pertinent. I read from section 136:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee.

In order to avoid conflict, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously agreed it would confer with the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. The radio part of the subject is simply an instrumentality. It does not reach the question of policy; it does not reach the question of what was in the mind of the persons who wrote the scripts and broadcast them to Europe or South America. The radio is merely an instrumentality. The subject matter goes further than that; it goes to the question of policy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to call the Senate's attention—

Mr. CONNALLY. Please read only part of that volume, not all of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, first session, March 26, 1947, at page 2590,

under the caption "Reference of Proposed Letter and Bill," I find this language:

The President pro tempore. The Chair has received—

Let us pay particular attention to this, please—

The Chair has received from the State Department a communication transmitting a draft of a bill to promote development of international radio broadcasting, to create an International Broadcasting Foundation, and for other purposes.

This is one of those situations, under the language of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, where a choice of committee references is clearly possible within the mandate of the reorganization law; but it seems in this instance the reference could be either to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Inasmuch as the bill had to do primarily with the creation of a domestic corporation dealing with the subject of radio broadcasting internationally, it seems to the Chair that the radio phase overrides whatever the international character of broadcasting involves. Therefore, without objection, and unless there is an appeal to the contrary, the Chair will refer this communication and proposed legislation to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There was no appeal from the decision of the Chair. In respect to that bill there was a situation similar to that which we are discussing at the moment, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question as between the other two committees can be settled after the Senate acts on the pending appeal from the decision of the Chair.

What the Senator was reading about the radio arrangements with foreign countries related to the private operation of international means of communication.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I again say that the State Department is taking the position that they contracted for this work with the broadcasting companies and that they have no responsibility concerning it. If that be true, then it is a domestic affair.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is the attitude of the State Department, the State Department is wrong. If I have an option to do or not to do something, and I make a contract with some one else to do it, he is doing it for me, and I am responsible. The State Department cannot wash its hands of responsibility.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 1,000 percent with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will continue to agree with me 1,000 percent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Texas in the position he has so well expressed and taken here today. He takes the position, as I understand, that the resolution is a matter which properly

goes to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. While I appreciate that the immediate question before the Senate, as I understand, is an appeal from a decision by the Chair that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Senator from Texas taking the view that it should have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think it is appropriate to point out two matters in support of the views expressed by the Senator from Texas.

First, the language of Public Law 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, with relation to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, says that to that committee shall be referred—

all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to * * *. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that clearly the subject matter under discussion is one involving "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally."

As regards the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the subject matter to which the Senator from Maine has referred is "communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television." As I see it, that is not the subject matter that is being discussed now. We have here a question—and I am interpolating a quotation—involving "subject matter transmitted" through "communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television."

Mr. President, that is not a subject which is confided by the Reorganization Act to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Reorganization Act, as I understand, confides to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the subject of communication—that is to say, the physical or technical or scientific means of communication—by telephone and telegraph, and not the subject matter transmitted thereby. To my mind the subject matter that is transmitted under the series of circumstances which we now have before us is a subject matter relating peculiarly and distinctively to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.

So, Mr. President, I take pleasure in associating myself, through the courtesy of the Senator from Texas at this time, with the position which he takes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Briefly.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Missouri takes the position that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. May I ask the Senator from Missouri, what is broadcasting?

Mr. DONNELL. I think broadcasting is the transmission of whatever goes out over the broadcast—music, or information, or whatever it may be. But I still think that the subject matter that is by

the Reorganization Act confided to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is not the subject matter transmitted through the telephone, telegraph, radio, and television, but it is merely—and I quote again from the act, "communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television." The subject matter which was transmitted is what is here important, not whether it went out through the proper antenna or was received by the proper antenna. The subject matter is that which is distinctly included within the term "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally." So, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained, and I trust that in due time it may be proper for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his very clear and strong statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose, instead of the information going out over the radio, under the sponsorship of the State Department, it had gone through the mail?

Mr. CONNALLY. Through the post office.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose it had been a letter sent by the State Department to our foreign representatives, to be broadcast over the world, with regard to the policy of the United States in international affairs? Certainly no one would contend that under those conditions a resolution of this sort ought to go to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The mail would be the mere mechanical agency of transmission of the policy of the State Department, through the Post Office, to foreign countries.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Texas. I expressed myself in that regard a moment ago. Suppose that out of the proposed investigation should come the necessity for legislation amending the law in regard to the Voice of America? Where would that legislation go? It would go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have no jurisdiction over legislation dealing with our foreign policy. So that we would have an investigation going on by one committee, and if it resulted in legislation, the legislation would have to come from another committee, which had not participated in the investigation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me proceed for a little while. What was the original concept of the Voice of America? What was it for? Was it to determine how many frequencies should go out over the radio? Was there any concept of the kilocycles, or any of the other of the technical things which relate to radio, which should be investigated by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? Of course not. The question was one of foreign policy, not

having to do with the mechanical details of the instrumentalities of transmission. The objective was to transmit to foreign countries the views of the United States on international relations, information regarding our form of government, information regarding democracy and parliamentary government.

Mr. President, what was the motive behind it? The motive was to affect and influence our international relations. Was not that the purpose? Why did we spend the appropriations? If that was not the purpose, let us cut it all out and let it go. Of course the purpose was to improve our foreign relations, to influence and improve the attitude of European nations toward the United States and our policies. Yet we are told now that because we find fault with this organization and want to give it attention, and want to correct its errors, we must go to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. We are told that the question must be asked: "How much money did you spend? We do not care anything about what you said to Europe. That is not important. We do not care anything about the policies you perverted and distorted into falsehood and libel, but we want to know how much money you spent." Mr. President, we already know that.

Then the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce comes along and says, "We are not concerned with what you send out over the airwaves, but we want to know exactly how many pulsations of the ether you disturbed."

Mr. President, I have high regard for the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has rendered a wonderful service in that committee. He has secured practical unanimity on substantially all big problems. I am sorry to see the chairman in his dual capacity: "Here I am over here as chairman of the committee, and here I am over here as Presiding Officer of the Senate. Now what shall I do? Oh, if only one of the dear charmers were away!"

No, Mr. President, the resolution should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I understand the present attitude of the Chair, if the appeal is sustained, then he will reconsider the matter and decide as between the two committees. So I urge the Senate to sustain the appeal from the decision of the Chair and let us go into this matter in a proper and better way. If we go into it, we shall probably have to hear some technical discussions by the Senator from Indiana and others as to what wavelengths should be used in transmitting the program and how many frequencies should be required. But, Mr. President, those are not the questions involved. The real questions are the peace of the world, the proper relationship of this Government to other countries, the proper understanding on the part of other governments and other peoples respecting the attitude of the United States. Who are the authorities that distort the information at the source by weighing it down with falsehood, slander, libel, and all the vile insinua-

tions contained in these broadcasts? Those are the questions involved.

Mr. President, I insist that the Chair is in error, and that the matter ought to be reconsidered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think we have had a great deal of discussion today which may or may not prove to be pertinent to the situation. It is my opinion that unless it is the desire of the Senate to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct a special investigation of the affair no resolution is necessary. Certainly, as I read the Reorganization Act, no resolution is necessary, in my opinion, to authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate a matter of this nature. It is possible that a resolution might be necessary to give it sufficient funds with which to conduct that investigation. But I believe there can be no question as to the authority of the Foreign Relations Committee to conduct an investigation or make a study of any matter which comes up or anything which occurs under that department of Government over which the committee has legislative jurisdiction.

By the same token, I can see no reason why the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee could have any claim whatsoever to an investigation of this kind unless it is clearly the desire of the Senate that that committee be given the authority to make the investigation. Certainly the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee does not supervise the affairs of the State Department. If this thing had been done by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or the Federal Communications Commission, or the Department of Commerce, then it would clearly have fallen within the right of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to make an investigation, although in that case the committee might have been obliged to ask for an appropriation to carry on the investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to conclude my statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish the Senator would yield on the point he has just mentioned.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well, I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. If it should be found that the National Broadcasting Co. were primarily responsible for this affair, their entire procedures and the character of their programs would fall within the purview of the Federal Communications Commission, and therefore the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would have the right to study broadcasting procedures. But in this particular instance, Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co. at most was acting as a paid agent for the State Department. It was money appropriated to the State Department that was being spent. Therefore I do not believe that in this instance the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee

would hold any jurisdiction whatsoever in regard to investigating the manner in which the State Department spent its money.

The law clearly authorizes the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make investigations of any agencies of Government at all levels. I shall read the language of the law. In the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 it is provided that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall have the duty of—

(B) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

Mr. President, several million dollars were appropriated to the State Department to promote good will for America and to promote an understanding of America throughout the world. It appears from what developed yesterday that a part of that money at least has been spent in sabotaging the reputation of the United States in foreign countries. Certainly that could not be called spending money economically or efficiently from the point of view of a citizen of the United States or from the point of view of Congress.

I can well understand the apprehension of the National Broadcasting Co. over an investigation of this kind. I can well understand the apprehension which might prevail in the State Department over an investigation of this kind. I have no doubt that the officials of the National Broadcasting Co. did not have the slightest idea of the kind of trash that was being sent out over their system. They probably could not have understood the language had they been listening in. I presume they were unaware of it, although that will develop later.

Certainly the higher officials of the State Department could not have read and approved these scripts which were broadcast. Nevertheless, they are, of course, responsible for the work of those who hold office under them.

Yesterday when this matter came up it seemed to me to be one of the most serious developments that has occurred in this country for a long time, in that an agency of government had permitted material to be broadcast to the world which was damaging to the United States. I lost no time in discussing the matter with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson], who, as everyone knows, is chairman of the Subcommittee on Expenditures which pays particular attention to "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

I suppose the Senate can proceed and act on the pending resolution if it likes, but I feel that it is my duty to tell the Senate that an investigation is already under way by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, through the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson]. We have the authority to conduct it, we have the money with which to conduct it, and I will say that it will take formal action to prevent the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive

Departments from carrying out its duties as prescribed by law.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield to the Senator from Michigan as I think he has a further statement to make at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Vermont can farm out the time on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. I know that he did not intend to farm out the time on the floor of the Senate, but I have been seeking recognition for some time merely to make a few observations concerning what I conceive to be the fundamental question involved here. It has been touched upon by the Senator from Texas and other Senators, but I think it cannot be too often emphasized. The question involved is not one of mechanical transmission of radio broadcasts, over which subject the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction. It is a question of fundamental, basic policies which affect the relations of this Nation with other nations of the world. That is all that is involved. Unless those policies are involved in these international broadcasts, there is no authority and no reason whatsoever for continuing them.

I recall quite well that in the testimony before our committee Secretary of State Marshall said that he considered this program one of the vital arms of the State Department. It is a part of the diplomatic procedures and methods of this Government. It is not a part of radio communication as such. Its only justification is that it seeks to improve our relations with other nations of the world.

In addition to what has been said about the Reorganization Act conferring general jurisdiction upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, the language of the act being "relations of the United States with foreign nations generally," it is also specifically provided in the Reorganization Act that all measures relating to the diplomatic service shall come under the jurisdiction of that committee. If this measure does not relate to the diplomatic service, it relates to nothing; it has no place or part in our legislative functions whatever, and the whole program should be discontinued. It is a part of the diplomatic service, a part of the State Department. That is the basis for the entire program.

Mr. President, I submitted the original resolution providing for an investigation of the Voice of America. That resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations without objection. It was considered by that committee and later included in other legislation. That proposal was agreed to; and there was authorized by the Congress a joint investigation by a committee consisting of members appointed from the membership of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Our committee was headed by the Senator from New Jersey

[Mr. SMITH]. The committee which conducted the investigation was not a joint committee. The committee of each House designated certain members of a separate committee, but a joint investigation was conducted.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has already assumed jurisdiction of this subject under the Reorganization Act. It has appointed a subcommittee of that committee, and the subcommittee has made its investigation. I am not at all sure that the power of the subcommittee has expired. If I recall correctly, it was appointed for this Congress, and I do not recall that any order has ever been made discharging the subcommittee, although it may have been.

Mr. FERGUSON. What subcommittee was that?

Mr. HATCH. It was a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was chairman of it. The Senator from New Jersey rose and modestly and generously said that he did not want to investigate himself and his own committee. I admire the modesty of the Senator from New Jersey, just as I admire the modesty of the President pro tempore, but I feel that both of them have fallen into error. They have fallen into the same error into which presiding officers, judges, and others fall when they are called upon to rule upon some question with respect to which there may be a special interest. They are inclined to lean over backward. I think that is exactly what the President pro tempore has done in making the ruling in this instance. I admire him for the disposition which he has manifested, but I believe that he leaned over backward, in detriment to his own committee. I believe that the Senator from New Jersey is guilty of the same error. He leaned over backward because he thought he might be placed in the position of seeking to prevent an investigation of the work which he so capably and efficiently carried on, with credit to himself, the subcommittee, the full committee, and the United States Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the point made by the Senator, but it really does not involve an investigation of the work of the Senator from New Jersey in the committee or the work of the committee.

Mr. HATCH. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. It involves the manner in which the State Department is carrying on the work laid down for it by the committee and by the Congress.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is entirely correct, and I agree with him. But it was the fear of the Senator from New Jersey that he might be in the position of seeking to interfere with an investigation of his committee. It is not an investigation of his committee at all. If it were an investigation of his committee, I would certainly oppose any such investigation.

In view of what was developed here yesterday, I believe that further study of the Voice of America and how it is operating under the legislation enacted by

Congress, which legislation was considered and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, should be made. Furthermore, I believe that under the Reorganization Act, that paragraph which was read by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and I think referred to by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] we not only have authority in that committee to study and investigate how this legislation is being administered by the State Department, but we have a high and solemn obligation to perform that duty. We do not need a resolution. We do not need additional authority to conduct such an investigation. Authority is already vested in the Committee on Foreign Relations by the Reorganization Act; and any move to transfer such authority to another committee is a move to divest the Committee on Foreign Relations of the duty and responsibility imposed upon it by law. Neither the Senator from New Jersey, with all his modesty, nor the President pro tempore, leaning over backward, has any right to shirk and avoid the responsibility which is placed upon us by the Reorganization Act. Certainly the United States Senate has no right to take from the Foreign Relations Committee the duty which the Congress has placed upon it.

Mr. President, by every consideration this resolution belongs with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and with no other committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to see that all Senators who have thus far spoken have agreed that there should be an investigation. It is refreshing to have Senators agree that at least an investigation should be made.

The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has undertaken to organize a staff so that the committee may take on the burden of investigations for the Senate. If the committee does not have jurisdiction in this case, I know of no case concerning any department of Government in which it would have jurisdiction. As I read the duties of the various committees, I note that their jurisdiction covers particular branches or departments of Government. The Foreign Relations Committee deals with the State Department and with questions affecting foreign relations; the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the Labor Department and subjects affecting labor; the Armed Services Committee with the Army and Navy, and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the subject of commerce. Every one of the agencies of Government is thoroughly covered, and under the theory which has been advanced there would be no jurisdiction for the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

As I remember the debates at the time when the Reorganization Act was under consideration, it was thought that the operations and activities of the Government should be studied at all levels, to determine their economy and efficiency. If there is anything which involves the efficiency of the Government, it is the broadcasting of these programs to South

America. The efficiency of the State Department, the Department which was responsible for the broadcasts, is certainly in question. There is to be an investigation. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is not going to attempt to investigate cases which other committees have a right to investigate without separate investigatory authority. Without the adoption of such a resolution, the Foreign Relations Committee can go into the question of how the broadcast affected South America. But already, yesterday, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments called together the committee, and last evening we proceeded to call witnesses, in order that we may determine how such a blunder could be made and how the efficiency could be so low that such broadcast could have been made by an agency of this great Nation, regardless of what was affected.

So already this morning the staff of the committee has undertaken to go into the question of the efficiency of this activity of the Government in connection with the broadcasting companies. I know of nothing that would prevent the Foreign Relations Committee from going into the questions that are involved, but I know of no reason why the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments should not continue the investigation it already has started.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the committee, for taking such action. I think they are to be commended for doing so.

In view of the fact that the Senator is now maintaining that his committee is so efficient, I should like to ask why something was not done about this matter weeks ago. An article about one of the broadcasts made by the Voice of America was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some weeks ago, in fact, under date of March 4, 1948. That broadcast was just about as silly and asinine as the ones I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 26, 1948.

Again I wish to congratulate the Senators, but I do not wish to have the Senate receive the impression that their committee is the only one that is qualified and is on the job and is efficient enough to handle this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from Indiana what difference it makes whether these broadcasts cost \$1 or \$10 or \$5, so far as the actual expenditures are concerned. That is not the question at all. The question is how our foreign relations have been affected by these slanders and libels.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said yesterday that today I would submit a resolution

calling for an investigation of this matter. Yesterday we talked at great length on the floor of the Senate about the broadcasts. I said no less than half a dozen times that I would submit a resolution calling for an investigation. I believe I was solicited to do so by the Senator from Texas.

But before we could submit the resolution, and before the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday's proceedings was printed, and almost before anyone could even turn around, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments proceeded to begin its investigation. I congratulate the committee. My only regret is that it did not do so 30, 60, or 90 days ago.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Indiana said that he stated half a dozen times yesterday that he would submit a resolution calling for an investigation of this matter. I should like to inform him, and the Senate as a whole, that the investigation was under way before the Senator from Indiana made that statement the first time. So far as I am concerned, he had not made the statement at all before I was discussing with the Senator from Michigan what we were going to do about the matter, and the Senator from Michigan was on the telephone directing the investigation to begin.

Furthermore, I am sure that had the committee known about this matter a month ago, the investigation would have started a month ago. If the Senator from Indiana had the information a month before the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments had it, it was his duty, it seems to me, to make the information public at that time, instead of waiting until this time. He had the same access to the press and to the radio that other Members of the Senate had.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presented the matter to the Senate at the earliest possible moment after the material was placed in my hands; and I am happy that I did so, because at least we are getting to the bottom of what I consider a dirty situation.

I regret exceedingly that there should be any argument today in regard to what committee has jurisdiction. This matter should be handled promptly by the United States Senate. The people who are responsible in this situation should be brought before a committee of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Indiana necessarily precipitated the controversy by writing into his resolution a request that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—even attempting to take away from the Chair the right to decide the question of which committee should have jurisdiction. There is no way to avoid

such a controversy when the Senator takes the attitude of writing into his resolution the name of the committee to which it should be referred.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe it was stated to the press that the resolution would be referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, before I even made the statement or submitted the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know who was responsible for that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator's statement was slightly inaccurate. The resolution proposes that the investigation shall be conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from Indiana is a member. But I point out that that by no means concludes the question of reference, for regardless of whether it is decided that the resolution should be referred to A committee or B committee or C committee—to the Foreign Relations Committee or to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—the only question is whether there should be an investigation, and whether the resolution proposing that an investigation be made should be adopted.

The question before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will not be whether it will make an investigation. It will be whether the Senate will authorize and direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make such an investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was merely replying to the Senator from Indiana, who had deplored the fact that we have gotten into a controversy over the question of the reference of the resolution. I pointed out that such a controversy could not be avoided when the Senator from Indiana wrote into the resolution the name of the committee which should make the investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Indiana did not write into the resolution the name of the committee which should make the investigation. He wrote into the resolution the name of the committee to which the resolution should be referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. But surely the Senator from Maine would not expect the resolution to be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and then have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce make the investigation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think much good may come out of this discussion, which may seem to have taken a great deal of the time of the Senate at a very congested period. Yet, the fundamental question here is one which ultimately must be resolved. There is no question that under the phraseology of the Reorganization Act and under one theory of its approach there is not a single subject which is not within the purview and jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the

Executive Departments. That point has been repeatedly made.

On the other hand, there are other standing committees which cover the whole field of governmental activities; and they, too, have a responsibility under section 136 of the act to make such investigations.

I have had repeated discussions about this matter with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] during the last few months, as we have been associated in investigation activities, and have pointed out that ultimately, by a process of comity, this question must be resolved.

I wish to point out that when this matter was presented this morning by the Senator from Indiana, and when he proposed that an investigation should proceed, it was immediately pointed out by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, who also is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the investigation was fully within the scope of the jurisdiction of various committees, but that in the interest of comity he should take up the matter with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I added the suggestion that we discuss it with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which appropriated the money for the program, and also with the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in order that by the gentle process of discussion we should resolve the question of how this matter could best be handled. Before we finish with the subject of reorganization, the basic principle behind this question must be determined.

The question is not whether one or another committee has jurisdiction, but how the matter may be most effectively and most appropriately handled. I do not think it can be questioned that some aspects of this matter are within the purview of many committees. However, I point out that while we are debating this question, the House committee is now making an investigation of this matter, and it has already called witnesses.

I think it is unfortunate that quite such precipitate action was taken after the Senator from Indiana yesterday indicated that he proposed to present a resolution dealing with this matter. I think a certain amount of senatorial consideration might have caused Senators to await his action before proceeding. In that respect, I think this situation is unfortunate.

I certainly would not wish today to have a vote overruling the decision of the Chair establish a precedent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], or its subcommittee headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], should be ousted of all responsibility which was bestowed upon that committee, not only by the Reorganization Act, but by the appropriation of \$200,000 for that purpose. I share the deep sympathy regarding the difficulty of deciding the matter, but I do not think the investigation should be delayed because of such considerations. I think we must develop some method of comity by which situa-

tions such as the present one shall be handled.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say for whatever it may be worth that I do not think the vote on the appeal from the decision of the Chair in regard to reference of the resolution would have the slightest effect upon the jurisdiction generally of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Michigan is chairman. They have authority under the law. They could go ahead and investigate the economical or efficient expenditure of money in any department. That is the purpose for which the committee was created.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, if its attention had been called to this particular situation, could, without a resolution, have gone on with the investigation, and, no doubt, would have done so. But here the Senator from Indiana, after bringing the matter yesterday to the attention of the Senate and announcing he would offer a resolution today, submits a resolution which, after one or two whereases, says:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby gives unanimous approval—

The Senator is a little off, there—

to a full and complete investigation of these agencies by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate.

It seems to me that, regardless of the vote upon the appeal from the decision of the Chair, whether it is sustained or overruled, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and any subcommittee authorized by it would continue to have such jurisdiction hereafter to go on with its investigations as it had heretofore. I am quite certain no possible effect can be had upon that committee and its jurisdiction, whatever happens to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think we now know what the issues are, and in all fairness to the Senate, in view of our heavy schedule, why do we not proceed to vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after the Senator from Indiana has taken so much time, and the Senator from Michigan has farmed out so much time, I should like to have the opportunity of saying a few words on this subject myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to state for the information of the Senate, so it may be on notice, that a call for the regular order will again bring the displaced persons bill, S. 2242, to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky, I am sure he will recognize the very great desirability of our developing some method

by which further discussions of this character in other situations which may arise shall be conducted, and that there shall be worked out some procedure, informal or otherwise, by which so far as possible difficulties of this character shall be avoided in the future.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, absolutely; I agree to that. It is unfortunate we have to get into a debate over a question of the jurisdiction of committees. But I was never more sincere in my life than I am in the assertion that the proposition, which is purely a parliamentary matter, as to which committee shall receive the resolution, in no way impinges upon or will impinge upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to investigate any department it sees fit to investigate.

Mr. BREWSTER. There can be no doubt of that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, in the event the decision of the Chair is overruled, whether the Senator from Kentucky would consider that it could in any way be construed as an admonition to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to soft pedal the investigation which it already has under way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all—or any other investigation it might make.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I felt certain that would be the Senator's position.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be so construed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wanted it made clear, so that no one would understand that the vote on the appeal, regardless of its result, would affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make full and complete investigations as to the manner in which money is spent by any Government department as written in the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think, by any stretch of the imagination, an adverse vote on the ruling of the Chair today would affect the jurisdiction of the committee of which the Senator from Vermont is chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall decline to yield further for a few moments, in order that I may say something on the pending question. I know that the Senate is interested in economy; at least, at times a slight indication is shown of a desire to economize. In the present instance the issue boils down to the question whether after the Senate has created a committee, staffed the committee, and appropriated money for the committee to carry on investigative work, to ascertain certain facts, when a resolution comes before the Senate asking for an investigation of facts, some other committee shall be authorized to do the work, and a new appropriation shall be made. That is exactly what we have before us today. The resolution concludes by saying:

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcom-

mittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Apparently the purpose is that the agencies shall investigate themselves. That is not the manner in which the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments works.

Reading further, the resolution provides:

The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be given immediate consideration by the Senate when so requested by said committee in an amount sufficient to carry out the purpose of this resolution, which expenses shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

So in the final analysis the question is whether, as suggested by the able Senator from Kentucky, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall continue and shall have full authority to continue, the investigation, or whether there shall be erected a new committee, for which new funds will be appropriated, to follow and go over the same grounds as those the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has begun to go over. That is the question before the Senate.

I think the able Senator who occupies the chair has made a reference to the proper committee which will promote uniformity and efficiency in the investigation, as well as economy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 39, answered "present" 1, as follows:

YEAS—34

Alken	Ecton	Martin
Bricker	Ferguson	Millikin
Bridges	Flanders	Morse
Buck	George	O'Connor
Butler	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Taft
Capper	Kem	Thye
Cooper	Knowland	Wilson
Cordon	Lodge	Young
Dworsnak	McCarthy	
Eastland	Malone	

NAYS—39

Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capehart	Johnson, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	McClellan	Sparkman
Donnell	McFarland	Stennis
Downey	McGrath	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Feazel	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Hatch	Murray	Williams

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—22

Baldwin	Lucas	Taylor
Ball	McCarran	Tobey
Bushfield	Magnuson	Umstead
Hawkes	Myers	Wagner
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Watkins
Hoey	Reed	Wiley
Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.	
Langer	Stewart	

So the Senate refused to sustain the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair makes a further reference of the resolution to the Committee of Foreign Relations, which action is again subject to appeal if any Senator desires to appeal.

There being no appeal, the resolution is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement, if I may, on the matter which has just been under discussion in the Senate.

Yesterday during the debate of the Voice of America program and the suggestions made by the Senator from Indiana, I stated that I had gotten in touch with Assistant Secretary of State George B. Allen and asked him if he would submit to me a statement, if he had any to make, which I might incorporate in the RECORD for the State Department. I have received a letter from Mr. Allen, dated May 27, which I should like to read into the RECORD. There is an exhibit attached, and I ask unanimous consent that the exhibit may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am sure this letter will be of interest to all my colleagues as it states the present posi-

tion of the State Department in the matter under consideration, and will have a bearing on the investigation which I believe will presently be made by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Secretary Allen writes as follows:

MAY 27, 1948.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Yesterday you requested me to give you information concerning scripts from the Know North America series broadcast during the past winter, under the Voice of America program.

I attach a memorandum which gives the background concerning these scripts and the contractual relationship between the Department of State and the National Broadcasting Co., by which the scripts were prepared. The scripts were broadcast in Spanish, beamed to Latin America, and were identified as presentations of NBC.

Note the next statement:

No mention of the Voice of America was made, I am glad to say, in the broadcasts.

I understood, from what the Senator from Indiana stated, that the Voice of America was referred to in the broadcast. Continuing, Secretary Allen says:

These scripts are as disappointing to me as I am certain they must be to the National Broadcasting Co. Since assuming my duties on March 31 of this year, I have gone into the existing contracts with private agencies with the determination to avoid if humanly possible any repetition of this sort of thing. We are in the process at this moment of negotiating new contracts with private agencies for the coming fiscal year which will provide adequate machinery for supervision by departmental personnel of all programs prior to their being broadcast. The question immediately arises, "Why was this not done before?"

I wish to invite your attention to the circumstances under which the existing contracts were executed last year.

The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee last spring contains the following language: "The committee is of the opinion that shortwave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters. The limitation (in the appropriation for personal services in the International Broadcasting Division of the State Department) is designed to limit the number of employees in this Division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for shortwave programming."

In the debate in the Senate, it was also made clear that the intent of Congress was that just as much of the broadcasting program as possible should be turned over to private broadcasters and that the latter should do the actual preparation of the script.

The whole intent of the committee report and the debate was that private broadcasters could do the job more effectively than the State Department and that the job should be left to them to the maximum possible extent.

While I had no personal connection with the negotiation of the existing contracts, I must say in all honesty, after examining the record, that they seem to me to have been drawn up in an effort to execute as faithfully as possible the clear intent of Congress.

I might interpolate here, Mr. President, that I am not personally agreeing with Mr. Allen on that point, and in reading the letter I am reading it to present his point of view, and not my own point of view. I continue reading from the letter:

Three categories of programs were adopted. The first and most important category was

news broadcasts. For eastern Europe and the critical areas, the State Department undertook to do all of this broadcasting itself, and the private agencies were quite content to allow the Department to do it, for the responsibility in this field was greater than any private agency wished to assume. For other areas, the State Department maintained close supervision over news broadcasts by private agencies.

I am glad to note that these broadcasts did not go to the European theater. The State Department did keep its supervision in that area. The letter continues:

The second category, covering editorial and news analysis, is handled in the same way.

The third category, that of features and entertainment, was left almost entirely to the private agencies, since it was in this field that the private agencies were most experienced and could presumably do the most effective job. It was in this category that the scripts under discussion were prepared. These 15-minute programs were broadcast once a week and constituted an infinitesimal portion of the weekly total of 231 hours of programs in all languages carried under the total Voice of America program.

During the Senate debate of yesterday, the question of loyalty and security investigations of personnel engaged in broadcasting was raised by several Senators.

I am glad to call the attention of the Senate to this statement:

As an invariable practice, all personnel employed by the Department in the information and educational exchange programs are subjected to a departmental security check. Under the requirements of Public Law 402, all personnel employed or assigned to this program must be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation prior to July 27, 1948. Such FBI investigations are now under way and many have been completed already. The question of security investigations on personnel employed by NBC under the shortwave-programming contract has been the subject of conferences with company representatives and the Department has been informed that NBC has secured reports on their personnel from the FBI.

I should point out that the record shows that at the time the appropriation was voted last year, the State Department made the statement that in its opinion the responsibility of the Secretary of State, accompanied by such extensive subcontracting arrangements as required by Congress, would create difficulties. However, the Department tried as honestly as it could to carry out the congressional directive, and supervision over this type of program was limited to general directives in accordance with the expressed belief that the private agencies could do a more effective job in this field.

We all learn by experience. Based on the views which have been expressed by Members of Congress during the hearings on the 1949 appropriations bill, it now seems clear that Members of Congress themselves have doubts regarding the view expressed last year.

It is abundantly clear that the existing type of contract is not satisfactory and new contracts are at present being drawn which will enable the Department to supervise the programs and carry out its responsibilities. It is clear from experience that if the Department is to be held responsible for the content of this type of program, the Department must have the authority and machinery for supervision. I believe the present debate has been salutary and I welcome any investigation of the operation so that all concerned will have a clearer understanding of the intent of Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, I read this letter because I stated yesterday that I would ask Mr. Allen for a statement. I place it in the RECORD so it may form a part of the record of the entire matter, not with an expression of opinion on my part as to its soundness or unsoundness, but in order to do justice to Mr. Allen, who should be permitted at this point to have his letter, together with the enclosures, placed in the RECORD as part of the discussion of this important subject.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to delay matters but I should like to call attention again to that part of the letter in which Mr. Allen makes abundantly clear that if the State Department is to be charged with responsibility it must have authority to and must supervise the programs.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is entirely correct, and that is one of the points I hope will be thoroughly investigated in the hearings and in the examinations respecting this matter, which now apparently will be made through the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, as the Senator well knows, one of the chief fears which has been expressed in that regard is that we would get into the field of censorship, which is something we all want to avoid. But this matter is purely, as has been said in the debate, a case of a diplomatic function of government. It is not a question of censorship of news agencies or broadcasting stations. If the State Department is to have charge of our diplomatic relations—and of course it does have charge of them—it must be responsible for all these activities and must have the necessary authority to carry them out.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I should like to add that Mr. Allen has been active as the head of this agency only since about the first of April. I have had several conversations with him. He has worked diligently to have his advisory committee organized in order to work out the program with entirely new forms of contracts which will certainly protect the people of the United States and the Government of the United States against such outrageous broadcasts as have been called to our attention. I am confident that the program can be worked out under the right policy and with the right support, and I know all Senators will be behind Assistant Secretary Allen in what he does in this respect.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the floor, but before leaving and before the discussion of the subject is concluded, I will say that I had understood that there is some feeling that the vote just taken expressed some lack of confidence in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I want to refute as strongly as possible any such idea or belief. In the vote which was cast and the arguments which were made, there was expressed by no Senator any lack of confidence in that committee or in any member thereof. I merely want to make that

statement for the RECORD, lest there might be a misinterpretation of the vote of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. In that connection, Mr. President, I may say it was my understanding that however the vote went, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments still has the responsibility, from the standpoint of expenditures, of investigating the matter, and I understand they are proposing to go ahead with that investigation. I sincerely hope they will do so from the standpoint of expenditures.

EXHIBIT A

"KNOW NORTH AMERICA" BROADCASTS

These broadcasts, prepared by the staff of the National Broadcasting Co., were discontinued on March 25, 1948. Until that date, the programs were broadcast as one of the weekly background shows in the Spanish-language service to Latin America. These 15-minute programs were broadcast once a week, and constituted an infinitesimal portion of the weekly total output of 231 hours of programs in all languages carried over the Voice of America. The programs were prepared by NBC under a general program contract between the Department of State and the network. A similar program contract exists between the Department and the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The scripts, all of which were broadcast last winter, were written by Rene Borgia, then a staff employee of the National Broadcasting Co., who worked under the immediate supervision of Alberto Ganderio, regional supervisor, Spanish section, NBC. A biographical sketch on Mr. Borgia is attached. Neither Borgia nor Ganderio is presently employed by NBC.

At present, NBC and CBS do 70 percent of all Voice of America broadcasts; the remaining 30 percent is done by the Department itself. The 30 percent of the total programming done by the Department is limited to what in June 1947 was believed to be the critical world areas—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and eastern Europe, part of the German and Austrian programs, and, in the Far East, China, and Korea. This is a result of limitations imposed by the fiscal 1948 appropriations legislation. These limitations are summarized concisely in the report on the bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The report contains the following language: "The committee is of the opinion that shortwave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters." The limitation (in the appropriation for personal services in the International Broadcasting Division of the State Department) is designed to limit the number of employees in this division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for shortwave programming." Under these directives, 70 percent of all broadcasting and all programs to Latin America are done by the two networks.

The International Broadcasting Division of the Department, which does the programming to the critical areas, uses only an insignificant proportion of its programming for background, music or entertainment shows (2 percent), concentrating instead on news and editorial and information programs. CBS and NBC, on the other hand, include a much higher percentage of such programs, 30 percent and 42 percent, respectively, in their total air time. There are two major reasons for this arrangement of program time: (a) IBD broadcasts to areas where free access to objective news and information is absent, hence such material is featured; the networks, broadcasting to areas where news flows with much more freedom and in substantial volume, must maintain a more diversified type of program to attract an

audience; and (b) the networks have been deemed more competent in the entertainment type of program based on their long and extensive domestic broadcasting experience.

The Department's existing contracts with the networks are based solely on the authority contained in the 1948 appropriations legislation, since what is now Public Law 402 was still pending in the Senate at the time the old contracts expired. In negotiating the present contracts, the Department was guided also by the wording of the Senate report on the appropriations bill, the specific budgetary limitations contained therein (the Senate committee report imposed a ceiling of \$100,000 for all supervision of broadcasts which included total administrative overhead for broadcasting, supervision of programs to the critical areas and for network programs) and the floor debate at the time the legislation was considered by the Senate.

During the House hearings on the first deficiency appropriation for 1948, which were held on March 10 and 11, 1948, there was a full review of the question of these broadcasts and the contractual relationships between the networks and the Department. Testimony given by a Department spokesman at those hearings (see Hearings, pp. 1071-1072, 1073) summarizes the broadcasting contract as follows:

"When the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported last spring on the appropriations relating to the information program, they said specifically in their report that they were setting a limitation on the funds available to the Department of State for salaries and expenses in the International Broadcasting Division. They said they would allow flexibility in other portions of the program, but they were setting a specific ceiling on the amount to be devoted to international broadcasts, and within that ceiling they were setting a lower ceiling which was to be used, and not to exceed that amount, for personal services in the International Broadcasting Division of the Department of State.

"The statement made in the committee report is as follows: 'The committee is of the opinion short-wave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters. The limitation is designed to limit the number of employees in this Division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for short-wave programming.' * * *

"In the debate in the Senate it was also clear in the discussions between, principally, Senator BALL and Senator SMITH that the intent was clear that just as much of this programming in the short-wave field as possible should be turned over by the Department of State to the private broadcasters. They made it quite clear that they hoped the Department of State would decide the general policy and the type of program that it wants; they made it equally clear that the intent, at least of the Senate committee, was that the contractor should do the actual preparation of the script and do the broadcasting itself. * * *

"It was clear from the debate in the Senate that the intent was that the Department of State should accept a general supervisory responsibility, but nowhere was it contemplated we should preview each and every word that went out on the air, and in the event that is the intent of Congress, we do not, frankly, have the set-up to do that at the present time. We do not have the manpower; we do not have the funds with which to do it. * * *

"The State Department, at the time this proposal (for turning over programming to the networks) was discussed, came forward and both informally and formally made a statement that in our opinion the delegation of the authority and the responsibility to the Secretary of State for this program accompanied by such extensive subcontract-

ing arrangements, would create difficulties. Those difficulties have occurred.

"We said further, and we said this informally:

"We have some hesitancy in determining whether we are actually going to be able to maintain the kind of control over the foreign-policy content of these programs that we believe a responsible public official needs to maintain."

"We said, however, the need for international broadcasting is so great, the urgency of the situation is such, that we are perfectly happy to try and work the situation out. We have attempted to work the situation out, and, frankly, the cooperation with the private broadcasters has been better, I think, from our point of view than we had anticipated.

"The presidents of both the companies and their responsible officials in this area have told me also that the cooperation had worked out better than they had expected. They felt it had been reflected in the actual performance that we are getting."

As to the terms of the present contract, the following is a quotation from the contract with CBS which is now in effect. The contract with NBC is substantially the same:

"The Department shall provide the contractor with general directives for each program to be prepared, produced, presented, transmitted, or broadcast by the contractor hereunder, indicating the general character of the programs and designating whether dramatic, musical, news, and so forth, fixing the length of the programs, and the hour or hours, and the day or days. When such directives have been delivered to the contractor, the contractor subject to the limitations expressed herein, shall assume full responsibility for complying with them and shall exercise complete authority over such preparation, production, presentation, transmission, and broadcast within the framework of such directives."

There has never been any doubt in the Department of State, either in performance or in interpretation of responsibility, that the Department directs contractors as to the type of program to be broadcast and supplies general and specific guidance governing the major programs. The Department within the existing budgeting limitations has been able to maintain a degree of precontrol and preediting of types of programs such as news, news analysis, commentary, and certain types of panel discussions, but this has not been true of feature or documentary programs or in the general field of entertainment.

During the Senate debate of yesterday, the question of loyalty and security investigations of personnel engaged in broadcasting was raised by several Senators. As an invariable practice all personnel employed by the Department in the information and educational exchange programs are subjected to a departmental security check. Under the requirements of Public Law 402, all personnel employed or assigned to this program must be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation prior to July 27, 1948. Such FBI investigations are now under way and many have been completed already. The question of security investigations on personnel employed by NBC under the short-wave programming contract has been the subject of conferences with company representatives and the Department has been informed that NBC has secured reports on their personnel from the FBI.

The Department has attempted to follow the wishes of Congress in the broadcasting field and also with respect to section 1005 of Public Law 402 (the Smith-Mundt Act), which reads:

"In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, includ-

ing existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

It is clear both to the Department and to the networks that the present situation is unsatisfactory. A new approach to the problem is now under consideration by the Department. In essence, this plan calls for the establishment of a contractual relationship between the networks and ourselves, much as that of a sponsor to a network. It eliminates duplication of news desks and language desks, and provides for closer supervision and control of all output—the output of the networks as well as the output of our own desks. This is believed to be not only more efficient and less wasteful, but it provides for enlisting the services of the networks in the field in which they are most experienced, while leaving to the Department the political aspects of the problems, the responsibility for which the Department cannot turn over to others.

RENE BORGIA

(Material supplied by National Broadcasting Co.)

Rene Borgia, writer of the National Broadcasting Co. scripts in the series "Know the United States," is of Venezuelan origin.

He came to this country in 1939. He has taken out his first United States naturalization papers. He has held important positions in the foreign-language departments of Fox Pictures, and Warner Bros. in Los Angeles.

He has published, in Spanish, books of poems, plays, and political pamphlets of an anti-Communist nature. A sample of one of these pamphlets is in the files of the National Broadcasting Division, Department of State. It is entitled "Anti-Communist Manifesto," published in Venezuela in Spanish in 1938.

Borgia has been employed since only 1942 as writer, adaptor, translator on Spanish language programs to Latin American broadcast by NBC. Topmost rating has been accorded by Latin American radio stations and listeners to two of his efforts during these years. Both of these were for translating and adapting the highly successful NBC-International programs Radio Theater (radio dramatizations of American short stories, novels, drama), and Counter Spy (series dealing with dramatizations of FBI tracking down spies during the war).

Borgia resides in New York City, is married and has several children.

He has never been employed by the Department of State or any other agency of the Government. His efforts in international radio, as far as the Department knows, have been strictly as writer-translator on a free-lance basis for NBC.

Rene Borgia's work has been known to the Department since January 1946.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a very brief statement?

Mr. SMITH. I yield the floor.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the concluding sentence of the remarks I made earlier today in connection with the Voice of America matter was:

So, Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained, and I trust that in due time it may be proper for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I voted, however, in the negative on the question, which I think substantially was: Shall the decision of the Chair in referring the resolution to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments stand as the judgment of the Senate?

I desire to explain that in uttering that certain portion of my sentence which I have quoted, in which I said:

I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained.

I had overlooked the parliamentary situation which existed and under which it was necessary that, in order that it might be possible to bring about a later reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the question presented by the Chair be negatively decided. Mr. President, instead of saying "I respectfully submit that the appeal in behalf of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be sustained," I should have said, "I respectfully submit that reference of the resolution to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should not be made."

Mr. President, the position which I favored and my advocacy of which I attempted to convey was that the committee to which the reference should be made is that on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to Mr. TABER, of the House of Representatives, by Rene Borgia, under date of March 1948, in which Mr. Borgia states that he wrote the Voice of America script on Wyoming, and that he prepared some 300 scripts for the State Department beginning shortly after Pearl Harbor.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., March 1948.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: I am the person who wrote that program on Wyoming. I don't blame you for not liking it. Of all concerned, I was the only one who protested, but I was ordered to write it that way. Whenever I said something about the series, the answer was always the same: "If you don't want to do it, we'll get someone else." I told the man in charge of the Spanish section that the program should be dignified, with some spontaneous humor, but not with artificial, silly jokes. They wanted neither history nor statistical facts, only light stuff to make people laugh. I explained to supervisors, producers, and directors that the programs were not in harmony with the policies of the State Department, and they told me I was working for a commercial enterprise and not for a Government agency, and that Congress itself had given them the program. What could I do? Resign? Yes, a few years ago I'd have thrown their instructions on their desks and leave, but now the only thing I have in the bank is children.

I was told not to worry, for the responsibility was theirs. And it is true, because after a program is broadcast, the writer's responsibility ends. If it was not right, why the supervisors, the producer, and the director okayed it? The reason is obvious. Mr. Richardson, the man in charge of the short-wave department, does not know a single word of any of the languages he is supposed to supervise. He had the innocence to tell me this: "I am now learning things which I should have investigated before." I told

Mr. Sarnoff everything, but he didn't pay any attention to me. The company, to put an end to the situation—after you complained, of course—had a brilliant idea, they threw me out. The danger, sir, is still there, because the men who forced me to write that program are floating around the office, very much satisfied with themselves.

Two of my first programs, The Mississippi River and Texas, were written as I thought they should be, yet I was rebuked for not following instructions. I had worked for the State Department since Pearl Harbor, and wrote over 300 programs, the best ever broadcast in Spanish. But there we had story conferences, and every script was read and analyzed. Even editorials were written in Mexico and Argentine about my war programs. The State Department, I think, has a very good opinion of my work.

Please, sir, do not judge my mentality by that thing, which sounds worse in stiff, literal English. I am a real writer, a scholar, with a long experience as a dramatist and a political commentator. Besides, sir, the National Broadcasting Co. hired me as a translator, but 3 weeks later they made me write three original programs every week. I begged them to give me that series, Know the United States, in English, because I didn't want to write the programs as I was told, but they refused.

I am deeply sorry for having bothered you with that program, and with this uncalled for letter, but I must tell you the facts. NBC is to blame for what has happened, not I. They should have able men in that department, which not only represents the policies of the studio, but mainly, those of the American Government. A million thanks, sir.

Most respectfully yours,

RENE BORGIA.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter under date of May 17, 1948, from Rene Borgia addressed to Mr. Brown, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 17, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I thank you for your letter. I don't remember writing anything about your State, but NBC is now blaming me for all that happens there. I, like the Cid, am winning battles after death! That program, Know the United States, had been going on before I started working for that madhouse. You ask if that program was supervised. No program in the world is broadcast without being read, cut, and supervised by at least three persons, especially in big studios like NBC. A writer cannot do those things. They hire us to prepare the scripts and to be blamed after, if anything goes wrong. If the program is a success, it is not because of the script—the producer and supervisor claim all the glory.

As I say in my letters to Mr. TABER, Gandero, the man in charge of the Spanish section, told me to write those programs that way, and they gave me the material. I protested again and again, because I wanted to do something more dignified, but they wanted neither history nor statistics, just stuff to make people laugh. What could I do? Mr. Gandero and Vasquez, the producer, are not the only responsible ones. The head of the whole short-wave department approved those programs, otherwise Gandero and Vasquez wouldn't be able to produce them. Whenever I complained, telling them that thing was not what the State Department wanted, Gandero told me: "What do you care? They were approved by Richardson." This gentleman is always shut off in his office, with two beautiful

dragons at its door, and an abstract "Thou shall not pass" in the atmosphere. I don't think this aloofness is aristocratic in origin, but to defend himself from those complicated languages of which he knows nothing. He perhaps thinks—"The less I am consulted, the less I'll err." Once, while revising something that I wrote, he asked Gandero if pandemonium had anything to do with pan Americanism. Gandero hurried back to his desk, where I was waiting for him, to ask me—if it had. What culture.

Mr. Brown, a writer's responsibility ends when he delivers his script. You may write whatever you want, but it is up to the editor in Salt Lake City to approve it. Besides, I wrote as I was told. Radio producers and supervisors cut and add as they see fit—very seldom one does recognize his own offsprings. The Government pays plenty to the networks, yet NBC does not hire actors. Its announcers do the job. In CBS things are different—they produce the shows with real actors and the supervising is in the hands of two able men, Unanue and Perez. I never worked for the State Department, but Mr. Mucio Delgado, now in Washington, checked all the scripts I did for the National Broadcasting Co. For over 5 years my work was praised to the skies all over the Spanish-speaking world. The State Department does not have to be defended, much less by an insignificant person like I, but they are not to blame for what has happened in NBC. I have been told that Congress itself gave the programs to the networks. Mr. Brown, I had nothing at all to do with what those people did: I was never inside a stage in NBC. I delivered my work to Mr. Gandero, and from there on it was their funeral, I mean, mine. You, who are a writer, please don't blame me, too. Since Mr. TABER's complaint I am out of work. Up to then I was the best Spanish radio writer in New York, now I am nothing. NBC took me, raped me, and threw me out.

Always at your service, most respectfully yours,

RENE BORGIA.

P. S.—The name of the head of the short-wave department is Stanley Richardson.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 6659. This is the bill extending the Second War Powers Act, and it has an expiration time limit on it of May 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6659) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. President; I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agree-

ing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] adding a proviso on page 5, line 1.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Moore
Barkley	Gurney	Morse
Brewster	Hatch	Murray
Bricker	Hawkes	O'Connor
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Buck	Hill	Reed
Butler	Holland	Revercomb
Byrd	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capper	Kem	Smith
Chavez	Kilgore	Sparkman
Connally	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Taft
Cordon	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eaton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	White
Feazel	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Malone	Williams
Flanders	Martin	Wilson
Fulbright	Maybank	Young
George	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in connection with the consideration of Senate bill 2242 a few days ago the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] raised some question about the citations contained in appendix 4 on page 80 of the printed report No. 950, dealing with homesteading and the use of public lands in continental United States and Alaska. I may say that the Senator from New Mexico reached the same conclusion as that reached in the report, but he raised some question as to the citation of authorities contained therein, and said that he felt the authorities were obsolete or not in point.

The law concerning homesteading and the use of public lands in continental United States and Alaska, as cited in the report of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization on Displaced Persons in Europe, has been rechecked by the committee staff and double-checked with counsel in the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, and we find that the citations contained in the report are correct. I feel that I should make this statement for the RECORD, so that no doubt will be cast upon the report or the citations contained in it.

What the Senator from New Mexico, Senator HATCH, probably had in mind the other day when he stated that the committee's citation was obsolete, was the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended.

No act has been passed repealing the homestead laws, except that the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1269, 43 U. S. C. 315) has been held to have repealed the stock-raising homestead provisions of the act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 862, 43 U. S. C. 291), but did not repeal any other of the homestead laws. In view of the general order of withdrawal,

Executive Order 6910 of November 26, 1934, and Executive Order 6964 of February 5, 1935, section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act was amended by the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976, 43 U. S. C. 315f), to provide for the classification of those lands covered by the withdrawal orders or within grazing districts, which are more valuable or suitable for the production of agricultural crops than for the production of native grasses and forage plants, or more valuable or suitable for any other use than for the use provided for under the Taylor Grazing Act, and for the opening of such lands for entry, selection, or location in accordance with such classification under applicable public land laws. The Taylor Grazing Act and this classification procedure have no application to Alaska, the territory dealt with and spoken of in appendix 4.

During the course of checking this matter with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior, this morning the committee staff was informed by the Bureau that during the last three fiscal years 213 applications for homesteading had been considered, 110 of which were approved, thus showing that the homestead laws are still in effect. There was a total of 1,723 classifications of public lands reviewed during the last three fiscal years, of which approximately 75 percent were approved.

I make this statement so as to keep the RECORD clear, and so as to sustain the accuracy of the statements contained in the report, under appendix 4 thereto.

Mr. President, the question now before the Senate is the amendment I have proposed, reading as follows:

On page 5, line 21, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add after the colon the following language: "Provided, however, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child under 21 years of age, of each of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits."

Mr. President, the amendment is offered to make certain that families will not be divided under the provision of the bill that 50 percent of those who are admitted must be persons who are engaged and have engaged and will be engaged in agricultural work.

My attention has been called to the use of the word "child" in the amendment. Although I feel that the use of that word in the singular number would embrace all of the class, yet in order to prevent any misunderstanding whatsoever from arising in regard to the meaning of the act, I now offer as a correction of my amendment the addition of the words "or children." I send to the desk at this time, Mr. President, the amendment with that correction stated therein, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5 in line 21, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add after the colon the following language: "Provided, however, That the wife, and unmarried dependent child or

children under 21 years of age, of each of such persons may, in accordance with the regulations of the Commission, be deemed to be of that class of persons who have been previously engaged in agricultural pursuits and who will be employed in the United States in agricultural pursuits."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I think the amendment is clear. I do not think there can be any doubt about it. I have heard of no opposition to it, and I am ready for the submission of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, so far as I personally am concerned, I have no objection to the modified amendment, and I know of no one who has any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that at this time the Senator from Michigan desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield the floor, so that the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I understand that the Revercomb amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And the Senator from Michigan is about to offer another amendment coming from members of the subcommittee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think at this time I should place in the RECORD a partial history of the displaced-persons legislation in the Senate.

PARTIAL HISTORY OF DP LEGISLATION IN SENATE

On July 2, 1947, the Senator from Michigan, on behalf of Mr. BALL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MORSE, and himself, introduced Senate bill 1563. The bill was essentially a statement of an intent that the United States should assume its fair share in the solution of the displaced-persons problem. It proposed to set up a program for the admission of displaced persons to the United States as nonquota immigrants for a 4-year period. It defined, in a broad scope, eligible displaced persons. It set up certain priorities for admissions. It did not attempt to fix a number which could be admitted in that 4-year period.

Mr. President, the reason for that was, it was thought at the time that the whole program should be examined, that the number of displaced persons should be ascertained, together with the number of persons we might be able to admit into this country, after which the bill could be used as a vehicle to carry the correct number.

The able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has related some of the further history of this displaced-persons

legislation. On July 26 Senate Resolution 137 was approved, authorizing the Judiciary Committee, or a subcommittee, to investigate the United States immigration system and the displaced-persons situation. The report on displaced persons was to be made by January 10, 1948. The reason for doing that was that the Senate was of the opinion it was an important problem, that time was of the essence, and that immediate action should be taken. The date, therefore, was fixed as of January 10, 1948. The date was extended to February 10, and later to March 1, by Senate Resolutions 178 and 193.

On March 1 a displaced-persons report was made to the Judiciary Committee by a special subcommittee whose studies had included on-the-spot investigations in Europe.

Mr. President, shortly after the close of the war in Europe the Senator from Michigan had an opportunity personally to visit certain of the displaced-persons camps in Europe. He is, therefore, somewhat familiar with the problem which presented itself in Europe in connection with the displaced-persons camps or settlements.

A proposed bill for the relief of displaced persons was included in the report filed by the subcommittee. As amended by the full committee, the bill was ordered to be introduced. It was reported on March 2. It is Senate bill 2242.

Mr. President, in the Judiciary Committee it was not unanimously believed that this was the bill which should be reported. There are, therefore, members of the Judiciary Committee, of which the Senator from Michigan is a member, who believe that a solution of the problems now facing not only the United States but the whole world, so far as displaced persons are concerned, will not be effected by Senate bill 2242. We have, I believe, certain fundamental differences in philosophy, by reason of which it is felt by some that the bill (S. 2242), now known as the committee bill, will not solve the problem. Those who believe it would not solve the problem felt so keenly about it that they were moved, because of their own philosophy, to propose from the floor amendments to the bill. That is my reason for appearing upon the floor today, as a cosponsor, with various amendments. Certain members of the Judiciary Committee and other Senators sincerely believe that, while Senate bill 2242 was a step in the direction of getting the matter to the floor, it was not the full step that is essential in order to solve the problem. That is the reason for offering certain amendments. There is a difference of opinion among Senators. Senators who brought forth the bill S. 2242 believe that the problem can be solved with that bill, but I think that, upon analyzing the bill and the various amendments, it will be found that something further is required, that certain amendments are necessary in order properly to solve the problem.

On April 1, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr.

COOPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and himself, the Senator from Michigan introduced six amendments to the bill (S. 2242).

The first of the amendments substitutes the critical date of April 21, 1947, for the date December 22, 1945, in connection with the definition of "eligible displaced persons." The latter date bore an artificial significance.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. May I inquire which amendment is the Senator discussing at the present time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall discuss them all briefly. The amendment I am now discussing increases the number of displaced persons who may be admitted to 200,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has the Senator called up his amendment? Is it the pending question?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I intend to call it up. I am referring to it now, and I shall call it up at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Am I correct in understanding that the first amendment which will be called up is the one dealing with the number of displaced persons to be admitted?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Michigan whether the amendment to which he is referring is the one dated April 1, 1948, lettered "E," which concerns itself with the number of displaced persons to be admitted, together with certain dates?

Mr. FERGUSON. It concerns itself with the number to be admitted. It is the amendment lettered "E." There are many amendments, and it required a moment or two to separate them and to ascertain the letter identifying the amendment now under discussion.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will yield, I believe he began to discuss the changing of the date.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had merely given the names of the sponsors.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the first amendment to be called up the one lettered "E"?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. The date of December 22, 1945, bore artificial significance as the date of the Presidential directive making regular immigration quota numbers available to displaced persons. Among other reasons, we believe the date of April 21, 1947, to be more equitable and administratively more workable.

A second proposal, marked "B," would delete, on technical grounds, the part of the definition of eligible displaced persons which refers to a return to Germany or Austria "as a result of enemy action, or of war circumstances."

A third amendment, marked "F," would substitute the word "adequate" in

deciding what kind of residence or living quarters they would have to have in this country, for the words "decent, safe, and sanitary."

Another amendment, marked "D," has as its purpose the establishing of a fair, adequate, and just basis for the selection of displaced-person immigrants. It provides for selection on the basis of a cross section of the groups and elements of displaced persons that existed in the camps on January 1, 1948.

To insure a more effective administration of the program, including selection, screening, transportation, and resettlement of DP's, another amendment, marked "C," proposes to broaden the authority of the special commission which is contemplated in the bill.

The number of displaced persons who may be admitted to the United States is a vital point in the legislation, as demonstrating our sincere intent to assume a fair share in the solution of the problem. The adoption of the amendment as against the limitation to 50,000 a year for 2 years, as provided in the committee bill, is essential to a solution, in cooperation with other nations. Its adoption is without prejudice to the employment or housing of United States citizens.

It is to this amendment that I wish to address myself at this time. Other Senators will address themselves to other amendments when they are brought to the floor.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 3, beginning with the word "fifty" in line 25, strike out down through and including line 6 on page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "two hundred thousand may be admitted into the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1949, and June 30, 1950, of which number not more than one hundred thousand may be admitted during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949."

In other words, no more than 100,000 could be admitted the first year, but if it were impossible to bring over 100,000 during the first year, then the number less than 100,000 could be added to the number to be admitted the second year, so that in the 2 years 200,000 could be brought into this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Chair to inquire whether the Senator from Michigan is desirous of offering the amendment at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I offer it at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate, and that will make the amendment the pending question.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, beginning with the word "fifty" in line 25, it is proposed to strike out down through and including line 6 on page 4, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Two hundred thousand may be admitted into the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1949, and June 30, 1950, of which number not more than 100,000 may be admitted during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E," offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the magnitude of the resettlement problem should be discussed.

It is estimated that there are approximately 836,000 displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy who have to be resettled. Of this number about 611,000 are in camps or centers. These are figures based on reports of the preparatory commission for the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948. I have seen numerous other estimates and they are confusing because it is necessary to distinguish among displaced persons receiving care and maintenance, out-of-

camp displaced persons eligible for care and maintenance but not receiving it, and other displaced persons who are receiving only legal assistance where they are, that is, are not part of the resettlement problem.

It may be remarked that these figures do not include Volksdeutsche or expellees, since, for reasons which can be treated at another place, they are not considered a part of the resettlement problem. The IRO constitution has not recognized them as such. From the evidence now in the RECORD it is clear that the Potsdam Agreement seems to settle those persons.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks table A and table B.

Table A summarizes the displaced persons population, in and out of camps, in Germany, Austria, and Italy, as of January 1.

Table B gives the nationality breakdown of those displaced persons.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to refer to them, except to make them a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United Nations displaced persons in the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy, as of Jan. 1, 1948

Country	United States zone			British zone			French zone			Italy, in camp	Totals		
	In camp	Out of camp	Total	In camp	Out of camp	Total	In camp	Out of camp	Total		In camp	Out of camp	Total
Germany.....	¹ 322,693	143,769	² 466,462	181,128	³ 15,549	196,677	24,966	9,422	34,388	-----	528,787	168,740	697,527
Austria.....	34,487	16,907	51,394	12,984	32,633	45,617	5,318	7,638	12,956	-----	52,789	57,178	109,967
Italy ⁴	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	{ ⁵ 18,579 ⁶ 10,916 }	29,495	(?)	29,495
Total.....	357,180	160,676	517,856	194,112	48,182	242,294	30,284	17,060	47,344	29,495	611,071	225,918	⁷ 836,989

¹ Not including 14,535 displaced persons (mainly Poles and Balts) employed by U. S. Army in civilian labor service units.

² Excludes 13,000 Yugoslavs from out-of-camp in Italy transferred to British zone, Germany, in March 1947. (See footnote 7.)

³ This figure consists of estimated 9,366 Poles and 6,183 Yugoslavs making up the civil fixed watchmen's service and other labor service groups.

⁴ Not allocated by zones.

⁵ Jewish. 7,000 in Hachsharoth and receiving PCIRO assistance and 11,579 in PCIRO camps.

⁶ Yugoslavs, Poles, Ukrainians, and other nationalities in PCIRO camps.
⁷ There are an estimated 100,000 displaced persons out-of-camp in Italy eligible for PCIRO assistance. No out-of-camp figure for Italy shown here or in 1946 charts, as no registration of these people has taken place.

United Nations displaced persons in the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and in Italy, as of Jan. 1, 1948 (by nationality, by country)

Nationality	Germany	Austria	Italy (in camp only)	Total
Polish (including Ukrainians).....	291,886	30,539	3,670	326,095
Baltic.....	161,518	3,929	160	165,607
Soviet.....	14,487	3,997	320	18,804
Yugoslav.....	¹ 27,376	26,279	5,500	59,155
Jewish.....	² (153,572)	24,512	18,579	³ 196,663
Others (including stateless).....	83,691	20,711	1,266	105,668
Total.....	⁴ 697,527	109,967	⁵ 29,495	⁶ 836,989

¹ This does not include an additional 13,000 Yugoslavs who were transferred to the British zone, Germany, in March 1947, from the out-of-camp displaced-persons population of Italy.

² Only 118,569 of this figure to be included in total as remainder is distributed among other nationalities in column.

³ Only 161,660 of this figure to be included in total. See (2) above.

⁴ Not including 14,535 displaced persons (mainly Poles and Balts) employed by U. S. Army in civilian labor service units in United States zone, Germany.

⁵ Not including an estimated 100,000 displaced persons out-of-camp in Italy who are eligible for PCIRO assistance, but of whom no registration has ever taken place.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, an essential purpose of this legislation is to demonstrate America's good faith in urging solution of the whole problem and to fulfill the obligations to which we have committed ourselves. If we take for our entire share as few as 100,000 displaced persons, this purpose will be frustrated. Merely to make an ineffective gesture toward solution will be worse than nothing in terms of achieving practical progress, and will gravely damage our prestige at a time when it is most valuable to us.

In the absence of specific international agreement and in the face of varying and complex factors it is manifestly difficult to assess our fair share of the resettlement problem.

The figure of 50,000 annual admissions for 2 years, as contemplated by the committee bill, is obviously an arbitrary figure. Likewise our figure of 200,000 admissions over 2 years is confessedly arbitrary. But, we feel that to provide for the acceptance of any lesser number would be patently inadequate. We feel that 200,000 admissions is a conservative figure and reasonably adequate. It is to be observed that this figure is a far smaller part of the total burden than the United States has assumed as its share of comparable international tasks such as UNRRA, IRO, and the International Bank. It is far below the number which the United States might be expected to accept on the basis of population, population and population density weighted, and population and national income weighted.

An apportionment of our fair share on the basis of our assumed international financial contributions would be as much as 784,000, taking UNRRA contributions as an index and no less than 400,000 on a basis of our population compared with 25 other nations.

RESETTLEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Too little attention has been directed to the fact that other nations have been alert to the displaced-persons problem, and have been active in attempting its solution. To no small extent the relief offered to displaced persons by other nations has been self-seeking. That is, they have recognized the value of displaced persons as new settlers and have promoted their immigration. That does not detract from the fact they have acted toward solution of the problem, and it is to be pointed out that in some instances this was done notwithstanding adverse domestic conditions.

Mr. President, I ask that table C be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE C.—Estimate of resettlement of United Nations displaced persons from the 3 western zones of Germany and Austria and from Italy since the end of World War II to countries other than the United States

Argentina.....	5,255
Australia ¹	1,699
Belgium.....	26,312
Brazil ²	3,500
Canada.....	10,053
England.....	40,000
France.....	16,065
French North Africa.....	1,000
Netherlands.....	2,326
Norway.....	400
Paraguay ³	3,421
Venezuela ⁴	5,000
Peru.....	625

Total..... 115,656

¹ As of Feb. 12, 1948.

² As of Jan. 31, 1948.

³ As of Mar. 13, 1948.

⁴ As of Feb. 17, 1948.

NOTE.—Except as indicated, statistics are as of Jan. 1, 1948.

Small numbers have gone to the following countries: Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Mexico, South Africa, Sweden, Uruguay, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Tanganyika, Spain, Austria, Belgian Congo, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Greece.

Palestine: No statistics are available at the present time as to the number of Jewish DP's who were settled in Palestine.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this table shows an estimate of the number of displaced persons who have been resettled in countries other than the United States, in western Europe, South America, and the British Dominions. It is

deserving of some special comment. England lost something approximately like 1,000,000 homes by bombing during the war. Despite that fact, the United Kingdom already has received about 40,000 displaced persons. And these are in addition to about 200,000 Poles who were in England as members of General Anders' government-in-exile army, not classified as DP's because they did not come from DP camps. Belgium, despite its extremely high density of population, has already accepted about 26,000 displaced persons. The resettlement program in South America has been particularly successful, and new resettlement agreements are being negotiated.

The IRO Preparatory Commission has furthered the resettlement program by negotiating resettlement agreements with interested countries by assisting selection missions in the displaced-persons camps, and by transporting DP's for overseas resettlement.

In addition to the numbers already taken, other countries have committed themselves to accepting increasingly large numbers of DP's.

Mr. President, I ask that table D be made a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE D.—Remaining numbers of displaced persons to be resettled under presently outstanding plans and agreements (excluding the United States)

(Estimate as of February 1948)

Country:	Number
Argentina.....	1,700
Brazil.....	1,500
Chile.....	4,000
Paraguay.....	800
Peru.....	4,400
Bolivia.....	400
Venezuela.....	10,000
Australia.....	18,000
Canada.....	9,900
England.....	60,000
Belgium.....	83,600
Netherlands.....	29,600
Total.....	223,900

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this table shows definite plans outstanding for the resettlement of DP's in other countries.

In this connection it is to be pointed out that these plans will fall far short of solving the problem unless the United States itself accepts 200,000, and United States participation in the project encourages these and other countries to increase their quotas. Officials dealing with this problem, in the IRO and in the State Department, constantly have stressed the importance of significant action by the United States in setting its sights reasonably high as a means of stimulating other countries to greater efforts.

HAS RESETTLEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES SKIMMED THE CREAM?

I have observed that the interest of other countries in the resettlement of displaced persons has been to no small extent self-seeking. Those countries have recognized these displaced persons as a vast potential contribution to their

cultures and economies. It has been suggested that as a consequence of that fact the cream of the displaced person population has been skimmed and that only the dregs remain. This I consider a specious argument where it is used against the admission of displaced persons to the United States. In the first place, only a minor fraction of the displaced persons population has been resettled. In the second place, the character of the displaced persons population as a whole has been rather definitely fixed as showing a very high proportion of skilled and agricultural workers. Despite the special demands in other countries for people of this character, their number is so great that it cannot be said only the dregs remain.

A staff member of the United States Employment Service has made a survey of occupational skills among 330,000 refugees in PCIRO assembly centers in Germany, Austria, and Italy. A summary of that report is significant, and I think it is well worth while to read it. It is as follows:

TABLE E

	Total males classified	Percent skilled	Percent agricultural workers
British zone, Germany.....	85,888	27.8	35.1
United States zone, Germany.....	90,507	24.8	17.5
French zone, Germany.....	14,431	26.6	39.1
Italy.....	14,656	42.0	23.2

THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM TO DATE

It cannot be said that the United States has been unaware of the displaced-persons problem, or that it has not been extremely helpful to the displaced persons of Europe, except in allowing them to enter this country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In connection with the skills and the types of persons who are left in the camps, is it not true that the largest numbers admitted into other countries were taken by Belgium, England, and France, and that in the case of England and France the great bulk of those who were taken were agricultural workers and in Belgium workers in the coal mines? So that, so far as industrial skills are concerned, the cream has not been taken off.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Massachusetts has raised a very interesting question, because it has been argued here time after time that we should take so many of the displaced persons, and that other countries would take so many if we would do so. The subcommittee which went to Europe last year had occasion to discuss this question with the ministers of France and England, and had occasion to find out what had been done respecting the admission of these persons. I wish to say to the able Senator that some men were being taken into

France for agricultural purposes and some for construction work, but principally for coal mining, according to the information given us. Men were being taken into Belgium for coal-mining purposes, and for the same purpose and other purposes into England. Canada has taken several thousand for agricultural purposes and for timber work, and I believe there was one group of about 100 for tailoring.

Let me point out to the Senator that those taken into France had to leave their families behind. Those taken into Canada had to be single men; they did not take their families with them. The same is true of Belgium. Those taken into Belgium left their families, either in the camps or somewhere else.

The pending bill provides that the displaced persons may bring their families into the United States, so that there shall be no separation of families. So when the Senator talks about the number taken into Belgium and into France and into Canada he is talking about men who were separated from their families, and only upon the strictest selection are they taken into those countries.

I wish to say further to the able Senator that I happened to be present personally, as were other members of the subcommittee who went to Europe, when it was reported to General Clay in Germany that several thousand displaced persons had been sent back from Belgium because they did not fit in, and they were put back into the settlements in which they had previously been located.

So when the Senator speaks about the numbers that other countries have taken, let us all understand that they have been taken by the other countries upon a highly selective basis. Usually the requirement has been that the individuals taken be single men, or, if married, that they leave their families behind, and the individuals were selected because of their ability to perform certain forms of work.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan and all who have worked upon the bill are familiar with that fact. But, Mr. President, there must be a solution of the problem. America will not return the displaced persons to Russia or to her satellite countries, nor will America compel them to go back to countries where they will be persecuted, or perhaps killed very soon after they arrive. So the problem is one which must be solved. It is one of the problems growing out of the war. When America was in the war she knew that there would be many problems which must be solved after the war. Now it is 3 years after the war in Europe has ended, and the question is asked why peace has not been made. We in the Senate today are debating one of the problems which is an aftermath of the Great War. What do we expect from civilization if we cannot solve a problem which is no more than the solution of the question of what to do with the placing of approximately 600,000 human beings who want to live in liberty and freedom?

Mr. President, I say that we must solve the problem. The small share some of us are today proposing that America take of these displaced persons, 200,000 of them, is but a pittance of the whole number who represent the problem which is

facing America and the world today. I do not see how we can have true peace in the world without a proper solution of this problem.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Unfortunately I have been obliged to attend a committee meeting and did not hear all the Senator from Michigan has said. As I understand, the Senator, by the amendment he is advocating, proposes that the number of persons to be admitted to the United States shall be increased to 200,000, in order that we may make progress toward the solution of the problem respecting displaced persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to ask the Senator, if the ceiling is increased to two hundred thousand, is it not true that everyone admitted must comply with all the immigration regulations, everyone must be carefully screened, and there must be some way worked out whereby those who are brought in are adapted to do the work for which jobs may be available? Is not that contemplated by the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. We are not insisting that necessarily 200,000 must come in, but that we are willing to take up to 200,000 in order to help solve the over-all problem?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. And it is figured that there will be 200,000 qualified to come in under our immigration laws, subject to a very strict screening.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has spoken about the displaced-persons problem being a tremendous one. Even if the Senate were to adopt the Senator's amendment and permit the entry of 200,000 persons, and even though 200,000 should qualify to come in, and be brought here, would that result in solving the problem?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; we will not have solved the problem, but we will have shown by such action that we have taken a fair number, and then we can properly say to the other countries, "Come along and do likewise."

Mr. HATCH. And by that kind of a general cooperative effort the problem may eventually be solved?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. But without our making such an effort will it ever be solved?

Mr. FERGUSON. In my opinion it will not be solved, and will result in the development of a cancer which can spread and may result in becoming the nucleus for another war.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say, in addition to what the Senator from Michigan has said and what the Senator from New Mexico has said, that even if all the persons who can be properly admitted into the various countries are taken from the camps, it will not entirely solve the problem. There will be what is called a hard core left which will be a problem of the United Nations or some international

organization for so long, in my opinion, as the two Senators and I are alive.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the statement made by the Senator from Michigan that, if the United States would take the action the Senator proposes it shall take, other countries will do thus and so. The Senator realizes that we have already taken into this country, and will have here by July 1 of this year, more displaced persons than any other country has taken in. That is a correct statement, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The pending bill provides for the admission of 50,000 persons a year for 2 years, or 100,000 in all. That number far exceeds that which any other countries have taken.

It must also be remembered that we take the displaced persons in by whole families, whereas other countries which have permitted the entry of displaced persons have required that they be single individuals, or, as I previously stated, if a man has a family, he must leave his family behind, and he must be selected for a particular job which is available in the country to which he is permitted entry, and which he can perform, and if he cannot perform it he is sent back, as has happened in Belgium. So when the Senator from Michigan argues that this country should take the lead and that the other countries will follow, I wish to point out to him that our country has already taken the lead, and taken a far greater number than has been taken into any other country, and under the pending bill we will do more than has been proposed or suggested be done by any other country in the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Notwithstanding the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. President, the fact is that America, according to population, according to wealth, according to industry, can absorb a greater number than even the number I propose, and then we will not equal what other nations have already done.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not understand the Senator from Michigan to say that if we did this thing all the other countries would do their full duty. We express the hope that they will, and we know that the problem can be solved only if all the nations cooperate. The Senator from Michigan did not say that they would.

Mr. FERGUSON. I could not speak for other nations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, neither the Senator from Michigan nor any other Senator can speak for other nations, but what has been revealed by inquiries into what has taken place indicates what other countries will do if we shall admit large numbers of displaced persons. Other countries have not taken their share. We know that has not happened.

Let me say a word with respect to the Senator's statement that, because of our large population and the condition of our industry and wealth, it is our duty to take in a greater percentage of displaced persons than taken in by other countries. It is a fact undeniable that this country has the largest foreign-born population of any country in the world. I do not deny that many of those persons have contributed to the progress of America; but I think it is not sound argument to say that because we have a large population we ought to make it larger. I intend to speak upon that subject later on. I do not think it is sound to say that because we have a large population, by reason of that large population we could take a greater percentage of displaced persons into America. There are definitely other factors to be dealt with, such factors as conditions in our own land; the shortage of housing, for instance. We must consider what we would face if there should be a recession in employment. Those factors must be taken into consideration. I rose to challenge the argument and the logic of the able Senator when he said that because we have a large population we ought to take in more than some other country. It seems to me the reverse should be the case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan, because I know he has devoted a great deal of time to the subject, what fact he relies upon when he says that if we adopt his amendment and take a large number of displaced persons into America other countries will then come forward and do the same. It occurs to me that they might agree with us to take in some at the same time we are taking in some. I should like to know what the prospects are for other countries taking in some displaced persons just because we have agreed to take in some of these unfortunate people.

Mr. FERGUSON. My statement was made upon the basis of consultation with members of the State Department who have been vitally concerned with this problem and have been in negotiation with other countries. They feel that we have now reached the point where America should act in order that other countries may have an inducement to proceed along the same line. With the International Refugee Organization as it is, we have done nothing except that which the President has done by an Executive order. He is allowing displaced persons to come in under the quota system; and it is expected that by July 1 of this year as many as 50,000 of them may have come into this country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, a great deal of time has now elapsed; but if in the beginning we had decided upon a policy of taking a substantial number of these unfortunate people into the United States, it might have been the part of wisdom if our Government had called a convention devoted exclusively to this

single subject, and started the convention off with the program that we should take so many if other members of the convention would take their proportionate share. In that way we could make a dent in the big pile.

I am not out of sympathy with the objective, but I am somewhat skeptical that other countries will take displaced persons simply because we take them. The history of the situation is—and the report so sets forth—that countries which so far have taken them have used the selective process, taking the most valuable, the cream off the top, as it were. What we propose to do is not to take the cream at all, but to take the homogeneous content.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much impressed by the statement of the Senator from Maryland. I think his skepticism as to the effect upon other nations of our taking displaced persons is well founded in the history of the situation. Strange as it may seem, since the war France has suffered from a shortage of labor. When France wanted workers did she seek them among the displaced persons? She obtained a few from that source, but she went to the Italian Government to make an agreement to get 200,000 Italian nationals to come into France and work. Last year when we were there she had obtained 60,000. That was all she had been able to contract for. Those Italian nationals came into France and worked. Does that indicate on the part of France a willingness to meet this problem? I think not.

Further with respect to France, and the very able men who head the French Government and are doing their best to reconstruct that country in a patriotic fashion, let me say that there are in France approximately 400,000 German military prisoners. They are there to this time. I understand that within the past few months some have been liberated. The right of freedom in France has been offered to Germans who, having been there for years as captive workers, would take up citizenship. We were told that approximately 110,000 had accepted that status.

Does that indicate on the part of France a desire to step into this problem and help solve it? No. The French are looking after the interests of their own country, very definitely.

Does the situation indicate on the part of Belgium, when she takes displaced persons solely as single men, or men who must leave their families behind, a desire to solve the problem? We were advised that displaced men could not bring their families into Belgium. The men were brought there for coal mining; and if they did not work as it was intended they should, were they resettled in Belgium? No. They were sent back for resettlement in the American and British zones.

In 1945, Canada, after having a royal commission examine into the subject, decided against permitting any immigration into Canada except from the Western Hemisphere countries and British possessions. Canada closed the gates,

and then sent commissions to Europe and brought in selected single men, most of them Polish nationals from Anders' army. I am advised that 8,500 were brought in. The first ones came in as agricultural workers. Others were admitted as timber workers. We were advised in Europe that a request had also been made for 100 tailors. Since that time the categories of workers may have been expanded. I am not advised as to what has happened in the past few months, but we are advised that up to date 8,500 have come in.

So I say to the Senator from Michigan that I do not believe that his argument carries the weight which he feels it does. The Senator argues, after there has been a history on the subject, that action in admitting displaced persons will stimulate other nations to take them.

We are approaching this question from two viewpoints: First, from the standpoint of relieving and helping these unfortunate people; and second, from the standpoint of the interest of this country. How many can we take care of without having displacements in this country? How many can we look after, in fairness, in trying to solve this problem? That is what the committee considered.

The figure which the Senator suggests was under consideration by the committee. It was the top figure, the largest figure suggested to the committee. After weeks of deliberation and work, the committee arrived at the figure of 50,000 a year, under the restrictions and safeguards contained in the bill.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the questions which have been raised by the Senator from Maryland, to be: What assurance do we have that action taken by this country in admitting 100,000 or 200,000 displaced persons will encourage action by other countries? Would it encourage them to take displaced persons?

According to the report made in February 1948, by the executive secretary of the International Refugee Organization, covering the period from July 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947, 92,236 displaced persons were resettled; 9,302 came to this country, and approximately 83,000 went to other countries. The United Kingdom accepted 26,426; Belgium, 15,894; France, 12,743; and the United States, 9,302. The three countries which took larger numbers are smaller in population and resources than in this country. We have taken a total of 30,000. Upon the record of experience other countries have done a great deal for displaced persons, taking in consideration their resources.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is true, however, that while Belgium, Great Britain, and France have taken more in the space of time to which he refers, they selected those whom they would take, to fulfill certain economic shortages in the labor

situation, whereas those who came to the United States came primarily on a purely humanitarian basis.

Mr. COOPER. I think that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a wide distinction between the selfish approach to the problem and the unselfish approach. The point I wish to make is that this problem can be solved only if the entire pool is to be absorbed on an unselfish basis. So long as selectivity is practiced, I do not think we can solve this problem at all, because no nation will take more than it can fit, like the pieces of a puzzle, into a particular pattern.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I continue reading the report signed by the executive secretary of the PCIRO, of February 1948, page 17:

Mass resettlement programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, contemplated the movement of 234,453 refugees to the 12 countries which were listed as having selection missions operating in the field—Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, the Netherlands, Peru, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, South Africa, and Switzerland.

In the report the statement is made that a definite agreement has been made with France on January 13, 1948, by which—

The French Government agrees to receive as large a number as possible of eligible refugees during the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, under specified conditions, and undertakes to establish on its territory the refugees' families.

If the report is true, I think it is fair to say that arrangements have been made to resettle 243,000 displaced persons in France during this fiscal year.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has stated that France has taken many more displaced persons than the United States has, and the Senator also feels that France has taken more displaced persons in proportion.

Let me read some figures, as of February 17, 1948:

The estimate of resettlement of displaced persons from the three western zones of Germany and of Austria and from Italy from the end of World War II to dates noted:

In France, December 31, 1947, 16,065.

There is the exact figure. More than that number have long ago come into the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Twenty-nine thousand came into the United States during the same period.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to have the Senator quote me correctly. I did not say that more displaced persons had been accepted by France than by the United States. I merely said that considering her resources, France has done more than we have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I say that France never took more than her needs, because she shortly will be going to Italy

to get people to help take care of the French labor problem.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, to go back to the original question, I think our Government is to be commended for pioneering in this humanitarian field. But my question was directed to the Senator from Michigan on this point: It is a great deal easier to get the other nations of the world to agree to take a definite quota before we take our quota, than it is for us to get them to follow suit after we have acted. So it seems to me that we have rather lost our bargaining power in this situation. If we are to absorb the maximum number of these unfortunate people, it seems to me we would do more to accomplish that if we formed a general pool with the other nations of the world, rather than if we acted independently and then said to them, "See what we have done in this respect. Now be your brother's keeper and go forth and do likewise." So I am afraid we have lost the psychological advantage we could have had, Mr. President, in connection with persuading the other nations to take their proper quotas of these unfortunate people. By acting more or less in an independent fashion, we have lost that advantage, it seems to me.

So far as concerns the point that once we have acted in this matter, the other nations will follow suit—according to the statement of certain officials in our State Department that they hope other nations will emulate our example—nevertheless they have no commitment to that effect. So I am afraid we shall have lost our opportunity to influence other nations which are able to absorb certain numbers of these persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I simply wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that I feel that one of the reasons why we have lost this bargaining power—and I agree that bargaining power has been lost—is that the State Department has no authority, being a part of the executive branch of our Government, to admit these persons in excess of the quotas, because there is a strict immigration law upon the statute books, and therefore it is a very difficult thing to bargain about.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate that hurdle or barricade which is in the way, but certainly the United States could negotiate with other countries a treaty dealing with this subject, and it could be submitted to this body for ratification; and under such a treaty I think we could fairly well take care of the matter.

Or if there is a legal imperfection to such procedure we could initiate in the Congress legislation calling on the Chief Executive to meet with other nations, and say that we would commit ourselves in advance to accept a certain number, provided other nations similarly circumstanced with the United States would do likewise.

In other words, there are many ways in which we could have tackled the barrier which now stands in the way of the accomplishment of a solution of this problem, to wit, our immigration laws.

I was only calling attention to the fact that we did not do anything about it, and thus we lost this great opportunity in the way of bargaining power. In my opinion, it would have helped many thousands of these unfortunate people—far beyond the number contemplated to be helped by this bill—if we had gone about the matter differently. We might have reached the core of this problem if we had induced other nations to assume their fair share while we were assuming our fair share of these displaced persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that for some reason or other the European nations do not desire to admit displaced persons from the camps in the occupied areas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would not say that is a fact, because they have accepted some of them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but they have accepted only a few selected individuals.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, we intend to make selections.

Mr. EASTLAND. I saw a statement by the Minister of Population of France that within the next 10 years France must have 3,000,000 additional workers if she is to survive. I saw figures indicating that in 8 of the 10 nations in the Marshall plan in the fall of 1948 there will be a need for 677,000 additional skilled workers in those 8 nations alone.

The statistics show that 60 percent of the persons in the camps in central Europe have skills. There is a need for them in Europe. There is not a need for them here. Why is it that the European countries will not take them?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I can answer that question.

The minority problem has been a serious one in every European country. They have never been able actually to solve the minority problem.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the minority problem?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall explain it. The only place where that problem is solved is in America. Our whole situation and our whole form of government are based upon the idea that all our people live under a system of equality under the law, and the minority groups have the same rights as any other groups, no matter what their nationality may be. But in Europe one of the real causes of the various wars has been that the people of Europe have not been able to solve their minority problems. They would persecute the people of one nationality or of another, and would be prejudiced against them. Such persons simply could not live in that country. That has been true in all the European countries.

But here in the United States, where so many of our people have comparatively recently come from foreign shores, many of these people would live in the homes of their relatives here. We know how to solve these minority problems. In the great State of Michigan it does not make any difference whether a man is a Pole, a Hungarian, a Czech, an Englishman, or of any other nationality. We try to do the best we can in the so-

lution of these problems. When we have a war, we do not tell all those who have come from a country on the other side in the war—for instance, the German people who are in the United States—to go back to the land from which they came.

But what was done in the satellite countries under the Potsdam agreement? The Germans who for centuries had been in those other lands were told, because they were a minority, to take to the highway and get into Germany as fast as they could. They were not even permitted to take their belongings with them. Thousands of them died.

That is why the countries of Europe cannot solve this problem by themselves. We have to help solve it, subject to our Constitution and our laws.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it a question of minorities or is it a question of nationalities?

Mr. FERGUSON. Either one, call it minorities or call it nationalities.

Mr. EASTLAND. Which is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say it is principally a matter of nationality, instead of minority. I classed the nationality as a minority. It is one and the same thing.

Mr. EASTLAND. In France, people of other nationalities are found. They are welcome in France. I do not think that could be the reason.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has been one of the great problems there.

Mr. EASTLAND. France holds out that she must have 3,000,000 additional workers within the next few years. She invites people of other nationalities to come. The Senator cited the fact that last fall there had been brought into France 60,000 Italian laborers. It could not be a question of nationality. For some reason, they do not want inmates of displaced persons camps. I think that is obvious. Now what is the reason?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I meant to address myself to the point raised by the Senator from Maryland, but I should like to say one word on the question last raised. The head of the IRO, Mr. Tuck, an American, has been studying this question. He has a staff that is constantly in touch with France as well as other countries. That problem is being approached as rapidly as possible. I do not know about the figure of 3,000,000 of which the Senator speaks. I have never heard of it. There has been a reference to some 50,000 or 60,000 people.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was announced by the French Minister.

Mr. SMITH. That would help solve the problem. I may say to the distinguished Senator that we have today under our care approximately 600,000 people in the camps, whom we are feeding through the PCIRO. If the whole joint movement of the nations were to collapse, we should still have to do something with that group. All we are asking is that there be set a ceiling of 200,000 in order to get the thing started. That means 400,000 must be placed somewhere else. Is not that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Michigan said this was a problem that grew out of the war and that it must be solved.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. In that statement he is absolutely correct.

Mr. SMITH. He is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. This bill is not going to solve it. Is it not a solution to move people into the British Empire, into the French Empire, into the Belgian Empire, and all over the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. SMITH. The question has been explored all over the world. There have been commissions going all over the world. They are trying to get settlements in Africa, and are working on that. They are trying to settle displaced persons in Santo Domingo, and are working on that. They are trying to get them into other countries. That is not the Italian case at all, which is still being worked on. All we are suggesting is that there be provided, of the 600,000 for whom we are responsible, a ceiling of 200,000 whom we are willing to attempt to place here, provided they meet our immigration requirements. It is a very reasonable suggestion to make.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator's statement lends support to the point I made a few moments ago in the discussion with the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from New Jersey says they have been in Africa, they have been all over the world, in an effort to place the inmates of displaced-persons camps, and that they have failed.

Mr. SMITH. No; I have not said that.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want to know if anyone else in the world wants them.

Mr. SMITH. Negotiations are proceeding. It is a very difficult problem, as we have found. The Senator from Maryland says, "Why was not somebody trying?" I may say that Mr. Tuck last summer, when we talked to him, was trying to get the different countries together. That was in September. I think the Senator was there. The purpose was to see if we could not agree upon some kind of acceptable quota, whereby we would take so many displaced persons, England would take so many, Australia would take so many, and so forth, all around the world. Our representative went over there. Our representative was sympathetic with it. He said, "We have no authority whatever because there has been no legislation enacted by the Congress and until there is legislation by the Congress it is impossible for us to negotiate."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator and I are in agreement on the desirability of that process. What I was attempting to bring out was that I felt a great opportunity had already been lost.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that we may recapture as much of the opportunity as is still available, I think those who have made some study of the bill might consider this idea—and I offer it without any profound thought—that we provide

for some sort of conference in order to see what can be done with a program on this subject, after we have taken whatever quota we care to take.

Mr. SMITH. I agree wholly with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, we should take this bill as the minimum for the purpose of providing that the President or the State Department shall contact other nations, either independently, bilaterally, or in a convention, to see what can be done to whittle this thing down to the irreducible minimum, rather than have the same thing said a year from now which the Senator from Michigan has just said, that there are imponderables in the way, and the State Department can do nothing about it. We ought to remove them from the further consideration of this problem, insofar as it is wise and practical, immediately in this bill. There ought to be some provision in the bill for the purpose of calling some kind of convention to deal with the problem. Does the Senator agree with me on that?

Mr. SMITH. I do, but I assume the Senator does not mean we should postpone any action on the pending bill until that is done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator wants this bill, for whatever number we agree on, as a starter, and then to have a convention called to clean up the whole thing. I agree with him, and will support his amendment to that effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am only pointing out that it would be better if we had done that initially, but, since it has not been done, in addition to passing whatever bill we deem wise, dealing with the subject that is now before the Senate, we ought to provide some way of dealing with the problem from now on, as we should have dealt with it from the beginning.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I agree with him entirely. He has made a very relevant suggestion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope some Senator will offer an amendment to that effect, because a year from now, if the question comes up again, the same old excuse will be made, and we shall have done nothing in the meantime.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the suggestion of the Senator. I think it is very relevant.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senators for their contributions, but I recall that when we debated the resolution on the IRO it was particularly stressed that nothing in the resolution would permit in any way changing or altering the immigration laws, and the resolution specifically notified the State Department, the executive branch, "Congress alone will handle this problem." Although today I would certainly favor what the able Senator from Maryland has in mind—that we solve the problem so far as 200,000 displaced persons are concerned—yet there will still remain need for further action, and the State Department should be required to endeavor to get a complete settlement of the problem with other nations because we cannot go on with it alone.

Mr. TYDINGS. Unless we place such a provision in the bill, I am afraid the State Department will have a legitimate excuse that Congress did not ask them to do it, did not provide an invitation to do it; therefore they felt powerless to undertake it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Up to date I think they have felt that way.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Along the line so ably touched upon by the Senator from Maryland, the Senator will recall that under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, called the Marshall plan, the Administrator is required to encourage arrangements among the participating countries in conjunction with the International Refugee Organization looking toward the just and practicable utilization of manpower available in any of the participating countries, in furtherance of the objectives and purposes of the act. In other words, they are authorized to endeavor to get as many workers as possible into various countries and resettle them, if necessary. Under the provisions of the Economic Act, the term "participating countries" includes dependent areas. Moreover, the act provides for procedure in connection with certain projects fostered by private investors. I think the Senator from Michigan is apprised of the fact, as are other members of the committee, that in some of the dependent areas projects have been fostered by private investors which have resulted in the colonization of displaced persons with some satisfactory results.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the very thing the Senator is speaking of. That process is to be fostered and encouraged by the administrator under the Marshall plan. For example, a number of displaced persons have been settled in French Morocco. It is reported that there is a potential capacity in north Africa for the resettlement of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. Workers are wanted there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator answer as to why they do not go there?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I suppose it is because they have not the work there, or they do not want to go. We cannot force them to go anywhere.

Mr. FERGUSON. We can never become a party to a system of enforced repatriation, and we should not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad the Senator has raised the question. If we ask persons in any of these camps, "Where do you want to go? Do you want to go to North Africa?", the reply is, "No; I want to go to America."

Mr. FERGUSON. We do not blame them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; but we have a situation to handle. We cannot open the gates and let them all come to America.

I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was speaking about general resettlement, not only resettlement in America.

Such a scheme has already been tried out in North Africa, where hundreds of

thousands are needed. It is stated that with, some success, they have already settled a large number of displaced persons in all kinds of construction work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has put his finger on the problem. My fear is that a great number of people will not be content to go anywhere except to the United States. A great many of them will remain in the camps, always hoping that something will arise which will enable them to come to America. If they are to be absorbed by the democratic nations of the earth, each such nation will have to take a certain prescribed quota. But I do not think we are called upon to take all of them. I am not opposed to the philosophy of the bill and I do not intend to oppose it; we are attempting to do our part, but if no one else is doing anything, those persons will stay where they are. The only way the problem will ever be solved is by having simultaneous action with other countries.

Mr. President, before I sit down I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and other Senators for the fine work they have done in connection with this subject. I think the report is most informative as showing the dangers as well as the humanity woven into the question. I think we owe these Senators a great debt of gratitude, because without this factual information we never could have approached this problem nor seen its ramifications as we are now likely to see them because we have the report before us.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Before the Senator from Maryland leaves the floor, let me say that I believe he has opened a valuable field of discussion and has made some valuable suggestions. He suggests that the problem ought to be solved in toto, that nations agree to complete the resettlement of the displaced persons. I agree with him. He has asked, "Why has not the United States taken such action?"

Mr. TYDINGS. Taken the lead.

Mr. COOPER. Public Law 146 of the Eightieth Congress, approved July 1, 1947, authorized the President to accept membership for the United States in the International Refugee Organization, but this provision was placed in the bill:

That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the

effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

By inserting that provision, the Congress said to the executive department, "You cannot conclude any agreement; further, you cannot take any action which would indicate that there would be any agreement upon the part of the United States to resettle any of these persons." Having placed that condition in the law, can we today, properly and honestly, criticize the executive department because it has not initiated these steps? In all fairness, I do not think we can.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wrote that language.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator allow me to answer the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is just the point. We did err. But what I am anxious to do is to correct our error at the first possible moment, so that it cannot be said a year or 2 years from now that we perpetuated the error already committed.

I agree with the Senator that it is not fair for us to criticize the executive department. I meant no particular criticism of any department. I was criticizing the way we have handled the matter. I agree that it is not fair to criticize the executive department when it is bound with the strings which we ourselves wrapped around it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I differ very directly with the able Senator from Kentucky and the able Senator from Maryland that the language which has just been read tied up the State Department and prevented it from doing anything.

Mr. TYDINGS. I accept the qualification from my good friend from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The language simply said, "We subscribe to the IRO in connection with its efforts, and when you do something you cannot conclude an agreement that will break down the immigration laws of this country, or resettle persons here without first coming to Congress." I believe that is absolutely right. It would be an absolute surrender of the sovereignty of this Nation in the control of immigration if that language had not been written into the law. I take full responsibility for the writing of the language. I offered the amendment which has been read by the Senator from Kentucky. I say that if that language had not been placed in the resolution, Congress would have surrendered its power over the immigration laws of the United States. I am glad the language is in the law, and I hope it will remain there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is estimated that about 8,000,000 displaced persons were liberated from slave labor and concentration camps in Europe by the invading Allied armies. It is impossible to compute the number who were liberated by American troops, probably millions. It is a magnificent tribute to

those armies and to the American troops in particular that about 7,000,000 DP's were repatriated in expeditious fashion. It is likewise a credit to the United States that it refused to be a party to any policy of forced repatriation where reprisal or persecution might await. Hundreds of thousands of the remaining were granted asylum in United States zones of occupation.

Some remarks have been made on the Senate floor today which would seem to favor forced repatriation. The Senator from Michigan does not believe in it. I hope the Senate of the United States does not believe in it. The United States Army did not believe in it. The Army tried to persuade the displaced persons to go back, but when they finally said "no," they were allowed to remain, and therefore forced repatriation was never actually put into effect.

About 60 percent are at present in United States controlled areas. We have contributed heavily toward their support. In fiscal 1947 we spent more than \$130,000,000 for the maintenance of displaced persons who were living under our flag. With the establishment of the IRO, or its preparatory commission, we authorized a contribution of more than \$73,000,000 in fiscal 1948. But we are not acting either in their interest or in ours by continuing to maintain them.

On December 22, 1945, the President issued a directive whereby displaced persons were given preference in filling regular immigration quotas. It was a humane gesture, but it was no more than a gesture. It did not alter existing immigration laws other than by that preference. It did not permit an increase in the number of immigrants who might come to the United States. It did not give DP's any quota numbers unused in the past. It provided no basis of selection other than provided by the immigration laws and their quotas, and it is important to realize that the bulk of DP's are from nations which have the lowest immigration quotas.

About 30,000 displaced persons have been admitted to the United States under the directive. Those admissions have disproportionately represented the elements in the displaced persons population because of the quota restrictions. In no event can it be called a significant resettlement program. It has, at best, been a demonstration of intent which demands pursuing. It has given valuable experience to the voluntary agencies—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—who will be important factors in the orderly development and distribution of employment and housing opportunities for DP's in the United States. In this connection, however, it should be observed that these agencies can effectively tap their huge resources throughout the country only if they have a substantial goal. As few as 50,000 a year, divided among the various agencies and hedged about by restrictions, could not be expected to engender as much enthusiasm or produce as satisfactory results as a larger program.

THE SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The committee, in its report on S. 2242, states that "in arriving at a conclusion

as to the number to be admitted it was felt that an appraisal should be made of the situation in the United States." As I have observed before, I believe this is a reasonable consideration which any country should make.

QUOTA IMMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Our immigration quota laws have been in effect since 1930. The annual quota for all European countries is approximately 150,000. The average number of quota immigrants has been only about 35,000. The net immigration, that is, the excess of admissions over departures, was 603,357 as against a possible 2,768,396 quota immigrants who could have entered the United States in the last 18 years. As pointed out by the committee report, this situation is due in part to the fact that a few countries with large quotas have used only a relatively small percentage of their quotas. It is also due in part to other factors, such as the economic depression and the interruption of immigration caused by the war.

The quota laws do not afford material relief to displaced persons because the displaced persons of Europe, except the German Jews, are from countries with relatively small and heavily oversubscribed quotas. At the same time, reference to data on unused quotas indicates the extent to which our immigration laws have made allowance for absorption far beyond the demands that the proposed legislation would impose.

Reference to the history of actual, rather than potential, admissions under the quota laws gives an even more conservative basis for justifying the admission of 200,000 displaced persons over a 2-year period.

Between 1930 and 1947, excluding the war years 1942-45, an average of 41,846 quota immigrants and an average of 35,174 nonquota immigrants entered the United States each year. It can safely be said that, but for the war, 167,383 quota immigrants and 140,588 nonquota immigrants, a total of 307,971, would have entered this country in the years 1942-45.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has been using figures with respect to those who might have come into the United States. The total number of quota immigrants—and I am not referring to non-quota immigrants, but to quota immigrants—admitted to the United States during the six war years, which we call fiscal years 1940 to 1945, inclusive, was 132,876. That is the total number of quota immigrants.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not used the same years the Senator employs, so my figures would not correspond with his.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This refers to the war years. The able Senator has talked about those who came in during the war. That number is much lower than the quota figures, 132,876. That number is only 48,147 less than the quota immigrants who were admitted into the United States during the preceding 6 years; that is, before 1940. In other words, there is

not such a great difference between the number of those who were admitted during the 6 years prior to the beginning of the war and the number admitted during the war. I merely call that to the distinguished Senator's attention.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have those figures. I had used the years 1942-45.

Actually, only 44,659 quota immigrants and 74,517 nonquota immigrants, totaling 119,176, entered in that period. The deficit of 188,616 approximates the number which we suggest in this amendment. Very little argument against such a number can be made upon the grounds of employment, housing, or assimilation, for it is reasonable to believe that such a number would now be in the United States under provisions of existing law, augmented by thousands of children born after entry, but for war conditions.

EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

At the outset it should be borne in mind that not all entrants under the displaced persons admission program will be competitors for employment, and that 200,000 persons does not represent a demand for that many housing units. It has been testified that at least 50 percent of those who would be admitted are women and children, and that therefore an estimate of 60 percent job seekers is probably too high. The average size of the family unit is 3.04. Assuming 52,000 single persons and 2,000 children are to be admitted, there would be left 146,000 in family groups, requiring about 48,000 family housing units.

The impact of these admissions upon employment perhaps can be best testified to by our labor organizations and by the Department of Labor. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has testified on this in House hearings on the Stratton bill, which proposed to admit not 200,000, but 400,000 persons in 4 years, which would be the equivalent of 200,000 in 2 years, as is proposed. Mr. Green has testified that the admission of as many as 400,000 displaced persons need have no appreciable effect on the labor market. Philip Murray, of the CIO, testified in the same manner. Moreover, Mr. Green suggested that even a mass entry of that number, not spread over a period as is contemplated in the present legislation, would have no ill effect.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony in those same hearings was that of Philip Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Labor, and I want to quote one passage from his testimony:

This belief (that there are only so many jobs and an increase in population means joblessness) implies a loss of faith in the potentialities of our free-enterprise system, a loss of faith in America as the land of unlimited opportunity.

I agree wholeheartedly with that remark.

We are at the moment in a period of record employment in the United States. At the same time there are areas of particular demand for workers. The Occupational Outlook, which is an appendix to the committee report is a significant reference. It shows that there is a particular demand for agricultural

workers, who are given a preference in the pending legislation and who comprise 24 percent of the displaced-person employables.

Mr. President, every year we are obliged to import from other countries, for seasonal employment, many persons who go from one place to another place in America and work.

There is an acute shortage of domestic and institutional help in this country, and 10 percent of the DP's are classified in this group, including 20 to 25 percent of the registered female employables. There is reason to believe that the clothing and needleworkers industry is threatened in at least 10 States by a shortage of help, and 6.4 percent of those classified are in this category, including about 6,000 tailors.

As for housing, perhaps the best testimony can come from the National Housing Administrator. Mr. Raymond Foley, on May 23, 1947, wrote to Representative STRATTON, sponsor of the House bill that called for the admission of 400,000 displaced persons, that "enactment of H. R. 2910 could have relatively small effect on the over-all housing shortage and the Housing Administration has no objection to its enactment." As recently as February 11, 1948, in response to an inquiry as to whether his statement of last May held good in the light of more recent conditions, he reported "the situation has not changed materially."

Those statements, like the statements of Mr. Green and Mr. Murray on the labor situation, undoubtedly were based on over-all considerations. For instance, in housing, it is probable that Mr. Foley was correlating the probable demand for 48,000 family housing units to which I have referred, broken down to 11,500 rural units and the remainder urban or nonrural, against an indicated supply of 321,000 habitable vacant housing units in rural areas and 410,000 in urban or nonrural areas.

The bill provides for bringing in agricultural employees. We all know that on many farms where workers are hired, or where tenants farm, housing is already provided. There is a shortage of farm workers in some places, and if farm workers or tenant farmers are not available the houses are held idle, because those who own the farms want to wait until they can secure help which will occupy the premises.

More specific resettlement and employment opportunities are desirable, however, and are required in the contemplation of the pending bill. To that end the activities of voluntary organizations in this country have been remarkable. There has been organized an American Council of Voluntary Agencies, comprising virtually all of the interested Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant groups. In January its representative testified before the Senate subcommittee considering this legislation and expressed his confidence that if legislation were clearly stated as giving a significant goal, his agencies could clearly demonstrate an ability to place and absorb all the DP's who might be admitted.

He revealed that there had already been organized, and there was in process,

a national inventory or survey of possible placements. The results of that survey, and of spontaneous surveys in at least 9 States, are now being made available. The results clearly support his expressions of confidence. In Iowa, for instance, a local survey revealed a welcome for 1,460 family units, jobs for 3,320, and specific housing opportunities for 875 families. A Kentucky survey showed a definite acceptability of 5,000. An incomplete Minnesota survey showed an acceptability of 3,000.

I have requested a preliminary summary of the surveys that have been conducted in Michigan. I am sure it will prove typical of other summaries which will be forthcoming. The people of Michigan have seen fit to make a survey. They are interested in the problem. They recognize that it is one of the issues that must be settled by the world. They, together with the citizens of other States, recognize that it must be solved. They want to do their part. They want to get back to a basis of real peace, and the question of what to do with displaced persons is a matter we must debate and settle, in order that we may return to a condition of real peace.

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND IS A CEILING FIGURE, WITH SAFEGUARDS ATTACHED

In any consideration of the numbers proposed by this amendment it should be clearly borne in mind that 200,000 is a ceiling for admissions and not a fixed figure. The amendment merely contemplates authorizing the entry of a number up to 200,000 who have otherwise fulfilled conditions which would prevent injury to the interests of the United States.

That must be borne in mind. It is not the purpose to bring in by lot or luck 200,000 persons and land them on the shores of the United States, at the ports of entry, and forget this question. Oh, no, the citizens of America are more interested in America than that. But they want to try and solve the problem. They want to find housing for these persons, they want to find employment for them, they want to find a means of assimilating them into the great freedom-loving land of America. That is one of the things we should help them do.

We propose to double the maximum number contemplated by the committee bill, and I have demonstrated the reasons why we believe that doubling is justified. We also would permit unused opportunities in the first fiscal year to be used in the second fiscal year. This would compensate for the inevitable time lag at the beginning of the program while processing procedures are being established, opportunities are being developed, and transportation is being organized.

But all the safeguards of the bill as reported by the committee would apply equally to the additional number. If the total number authorized could not qualify, for any reason, then a lesser number than 200,000 would be admitted.

Mr. President, even though there has been a considerable time lag, we should seize the present opportunity immediately so that we may do our share in solving the problem.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment providing for the admission

of 200,000 displaced persons into the United States during the next 2 years, if they can qualify for entry under our laws and our screening.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in the hope that we may reach an early vote so as to dispose of the pending amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Moore
Brewster	Gurney	Morse
Bricker	Hatch	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	O'Connor
Brooks	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Buck	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler	Holland	Pepper
Byrd	Ives	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eaton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Feazel	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Wilson
Flanders	Maybank	Young
Fulbright	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators, on page 3, beginning in line 25.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, without further delaying the vote on this amendment, I wish briefly to summarize, within a very few minutes, my position on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The whole effect of his amendment is to change the number who would be admitted. The committee bill provides that 50,000 a year shall be admitted for 2 years. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan raises the number from 50,000 a year to 100,000 a year. It does more than that. If 100,000 do not come in the first year, a number representing the difference between those who do come in and 100,000 is to be added to the 100,000 for the second year.

The figure of 100,000 a year provided for in the amendment was considered by the committee. It is the largest number suggested by anyone before the committee in its deliberations upon the bill.

There are many reasons why I feel—and why the majority of the committee feel—that this number should not be accepted. I invite the attention of Senators to some figures dealing with this subject.

In the first place, in considering the number who should be permitted to enter, we must also take into consideration those who enter under our immigration laws. Remember that the proposal in the amendment, like the proposal in the bill itself, is that, besides those who may now enter under our immigration laws, persons shall be admitted into this country for permanent resi-

dence. Under existing law, 150,000 persons may enter from the countries of Europe under what are known as the quotas. Others, known as nonquota immigrants, may come in. They are principally kinfolk of persons who are already here.

In addition to these classes, there is the category known as nonimmigrants. They are persons who come here on visits, for diplomatic purposes, as trade or treaty merchants, or persons who are supposed to be en route to other countries. So there are many persons who enter the gates of the United States each year.

In calling attention to these numbers, I hope they will impress themselves upon the Members of the Senate as showing the very broad welcome the United States under its laws, has given the people of the world during the years.

It is now proposed, both in the bill and in the pending amendment, that the number be increased. Seventy-six thousand nonquota immigrants came into the United States last year. Approximately 70,000 quota immigrants came into the United States last year. Three hundred and sixty-six thousand nonimmigrants entered the gates of our country last year.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan prevails, it will provide for entry into the United States and for permanent residence here of more than the total number of both the nonquota and the quota immigrants who entered the United States last year under our laws. I think that is an important point to bear in mind.

There are other reasons which had to be weighed by the committee in arriving at its conclusions. The committee met day after day and week after week, and we had the assistance of a staff which worked diligently with us. We had to weigh many points and consider many subjects.

The Congress of the United States must not forget that here in the United States we have problems which we cannot overlook if we are to be fair to our own people. Today there are in the United States 2,000,000 families without housing—not 2,000,000 people, but 2,000,000 families throughout the country. Are we to disregard their situation? I say we cannot do so. There are 2,000,000 young men, veterans of the war, who now are in school, waiting to graduate from school and to take up their life work in this country. Are we to ignore their situation? I think that cannot be fairly done.

So, Mr. President, without reviewing all the processes through which the committee went in its attempt to arrive at a fair figure in meeting this problem, I point out that the committee has arrived at the figure 50,000.

The population of the United States is increasing. That is another matter to which we must give attention. For instance, I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Times of March 11, 1948, based on an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, D. C., on March 10, 1948. It reads in part as follows:

The United States population reached a new high of 145,340,000 at the start of this

year, after 1947 proved the biggest single year of growth in history.

Mr. President, these are great and difficult problems that we must meet. Regardless of whatever our feelings in the matter may be, the figures in connection with these problems must be weighed and must be carefully considered, when we contemplate increasing the number of persons who may enter the United States from other countries, to be permanent residents of the United States.

Mr. President, we have reviewed the work of the committee, as set forth in the report. A reading of the report will present the picture and the figures in connection with it.

So, without further debate, I wish to state that I feel that the committee should be sustained. Although the members of the committee were not in entire agreement throughout the consideration of this matter, finally, after many weeks of work upon the subject and after a consideration of the great number of facets of the problem, we reached the conclusion which is set forth in the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to sustain the committee in its work, so that we may meet the problem and so that we may try out the proposed solution over the course of 2 years. Let us try to meet it on the basis of the committee's work and the committee's recommendation, which is the result of very extensive efforts on the part of the committee. Let us try to meet the problem in this way. If we do so, and if thereafter it is found that we can handle more of these persons, then the provisions of the bill can be changed later on. But at this time, at the beginning of this new venture, I ask the Senate to sustain the committee in its work.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The pending amendment is one of several which present a complete picture; and if they are adopted, they will destroy the committee bill and will repudiate the work the committee has done.

I think the pending amendment should be considered in the light of amendment K, which later will be offered. Amendment K provides that on page 2, in lines 5 and 6, the word and figures "December 22, 1945," be stricken out, and in lieu thereof there be inserted "April 21, 1947."

The distinguished Senator has made a very fine argument, but I think he should discuss amendment K at this time, so that the Senate can properly face the issues which are involved. Amendment K is really a part of the amendment now pending.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, amendment K relates to another phase of the bill. The pending amendment E deals solely with the numbers of such persons to be admitted. I believe that without further discussion, inasmuch as the Senate is fully apprised of the facts, we can proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators, being the amendment

lettered "E," beginning on page 3, in line 25.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay a vote on the amendment. If the Senator from West Virginia prefers to have the amendment voted on now, I shall postpone making some remarks which I have prepared on the bill generally and also on the amendment the Senator has offered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has addressed an inquiry to the Senator from West Virginia, and no doubt the Senator from Rhode Island will wish to repeat it.

Mr. McGRATH. I thought I had an understanding with the Senator from West Virginia that I would not delay a vote on his proposed amendment if he wished to proceed with it now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. McGRATH. However, the remarks I wish to make on the bill deal somewhat with the subject matter of the amendment itself. I am perfectly agreeable either to make my remarks now or to make them after the vote is taken. My preference would be to make them at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understood from the Senator he would be perfectly agreeable to proceeding with the vote on this particular amendment, if the Senator might be recognized and proceed with what he may have to say, after the vote is taken.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Rhode Island is going to speak on the subject matter of this particular amendment, I am sure he will speak with his usual ability, and I think it would be a mistake for him to wait until after the amendment has been voted upon.

Mr. McGRATH. I may say, Mr. President, the subject matter of the amendment is also a part of the subject matter of the substitute bill which the Senator from New Mexico and myself have introduced. Whether we shall call it up or not after the work on the committee bill is concluded, depends largely upon the degree of perfection we have been able to write into the committee bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I may clarify the situation somewhat, in order that the position of the Senator from Rhode Island may not be misunderstood, or my position either, for that matter. I have not spoken on this question, because I wanted a vote, and I did not want to delay the action of the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Rhode Island is strongly supporting the amendment, is he not?

Mr. McGRATH. I am strongly supporting the amendment to permit the entrance of 200,000 displaced persons over a period of 2 years. I shall vote for the amendment when the vote is taken. If it fails on the vote, I shall offer a sub-

stitute for the committee bill, so we may have another opportunity to consider the question of the number of displaced persons that should be admitted.

I am perfectly willing to proceed to a vote now on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan and make my remarks after the vote is taken, if that is the wish of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the light of the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island, I want to make the statement for myself also, that I not only favor this particular amendment but if it should fail, regardless of the other amendment, I think we would be compelled to offer the substitute proposal we have for the entire bill. But, like the Senator from Rhode Island, I do not now desire to delay the vote, but am perfectly willing that it be taken at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	Moore
Brewster	Gurney	Morse
Bricker	Hatch	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	O'Connor
Brooks	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Buck	Hill	O'Mahoney
Butler	Holland	Pepper
Byrd	Ives	Revercomb
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	Kem	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Feazel	Malone	Williams
Ferguson	Martin	Wilson
Flanders	Maybank	Young
Fulbright	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "E" submitted by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator

from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—40

Alken	Hatch	O'Connor
Brewster	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarthy	Thye
Cooper	McGrath	Vandenberg
Downey	McMahon	Wherry
Eaton	Martin	Wilson
Ferguson	Millikin	Young
Flanders	Morse	
Fulbright	Murray	

NAYS—33

Butler	Dworshak	Hill
Byrd	Eastland	Holland
Capehart	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Chavez	Feazel	Kern
Connally	George	Langer
Cordon	Gurney	McFarland
Donnell	Hickenlooper	McKellar

Malone
Maybank
Moore
O'Daniel

Revercomb
Robertson, Va.
Russell
Sparkman

Stennis
Tydings
Wiley
Williams

NOT VOTING—23

Baldwin
Ball
Barkley
Bushfield
Green
Hawkes
Hoey
Jenner

Lucas
McCarran
McClellan
Magnuson
Myers
Reed
Robertson, Wyo.
Stewart

Taylor
Thomas, Okla.
Tobey
Umstead
Wagner
Watkins
White

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators was agreed to.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2389, for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "\$2,335" insert the figures "\$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

H. M. KILGORE,
E. H. MOORE,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MOORE. This is a private claim bill which the House passed in the amount of \$7,790, and which the Senate amended by striking out "\$7,790" and inserting "\$2,335." The conferees of the respective Houses have met and have agreed to recommend the compromise figure of \$6,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS
ACT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the South has often been severely criticized for her so-called one-party system. On numerous occasions I have heard the charge that we "blindly vote Democratic." Those who make such a charge might well study closely the South's great need for world markets for her products.

In supporting in the past the political party which believes in expanding world trade, the South has upheld the best interests of the Nation. If the United States had followed the policies of the Democratic Party, there would have been no depression and no World War II.

Mr. President, the Republican Party has learned nothing from the bitter experiences of the past. That party is not suited to govern the United States in the twentieth century. The moment the Republican Party achieves even the smallest majority voice in the affairs of the Nation, we begin to hear talk of high tariffs.

Today we are faced with an attempt by the Republican leadership in Congress to shut off the fine relationship between the United States and many other nations resulting from 14 years of successful operation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I submit at this point some observations of my fellow Mississippian, Howard Suttle, a Washington correspondent and radio news reporter, whose column, *Liftin' the Lid on Washington*, is published by several southern newspapers. Mr. Suttle aptly points out that the reciprocal trade program has been developed under the "back-scratch" principle of "live and let live." It permits tariff reductions on imports to America from friendly nations only when such nations permit proportionate reductions on exports of our products to their people.

Mr. Suttle's column is printed in the Jackson, Miss., *Daily News* and other southern newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Howard Suttle)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans who criticize the South's so-called one-party system might well give close study to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which expires June 12 unless Congress acts soon to extend it.

It was about 15 years ago that Tennessee's great Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, successfully championed adoption by Congress on an international scale of the principle of "you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" in America's program to sell her surplus agricultural and industrial products in world markets.

It's the same principle under which George Godwin, the advertising and publicity genius who prefers living in his native Mississippi to a five-figure income in the maelstrom of Manhattan, developed the annual "back-scratch" celebration of the Jackson Chamber of Commerce.

The Hull-sponsored program today faces abandonment by a Republican-dominated Congress whose age-old high-tariff policies have done more than anything else to prevent the GOP from making headway in the South.

SELLS FARM PRODUCTS ABROAD

There are those who contend that southerners today "vote democratic because my father and my grandfather voted democratic." However, a better analysis would be that Dixie citizens vote democratic because that's the side of our bread which has butter on it—or maybe we now should say, "which has margarine on it."

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does not abrogate any existing tariff laws. It simply permits the President, through the State Department, to enter into agreements with foreign nations whereby import duties on certain of their products may be lowered if they will grant the same concessions to specific American products.

The program, in effect for 14 years, has resulted in the sale of billions of dollars' worth of cotton, beef, tobacco, and other

products of southern agriculture. In fact, last year, America sold \$14,400,000,000 worth of farm and industrial products to foreign nations under the plan, while importing products aggregating only \$5,700,000,000—less than half the value of our exports.

True enough, we've had our troubles with the program. On one occasion, President Roosevelt worked out an agreement with Argentina whereby the nation was flooded with imported canned beef at a time when we had a surplus of domestic beef. We imported the beef, however, in order to sell the Argentines more American products. Generally speaking, the program has been a great success.

GOP PLAN WEAKENING

Mississippi Members of Congress well realizing the need for foreign markets in which to move Magnolia State farm products, favor extension of the reciprocal-trade plan with little or no change.

The outcome is in doubt, for the Republican leadership plans some amendments that would reassert the principle of high tariffs as set forth in the famous Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930, which the late Senator Pat Harrison so vigorously opposed and stumped the Nation in unsuccessful efforts to defeat.

Currently, the GOP leans toward a so-called flexible import fee plan proposed by Senator GEORGE MALONE, freshman Senator from Nevada. Because of the national reaction to the word tariff, as a result of the Smoot-Hawley Act's unpopularity, MALONE uses the expression, "fee," to designate import duty.

But the Nevadan's bill restricts the proviso permitting agreements between America and other nations interested in trading with us. While he contends the proposal would encourage imports, it has the safeguard of a flexible duty that could be revised on the basis of production costs in foreign nations.

MALONE proposes the prevailing standard of living as a yardstick, which would permit revision of import duty rates to protect American standards. He would provide for increase in duties in event a foreign nation adjusted its currency in efforts to achieve competitive advantages.

The legislation would permit free trade between nations whose living standards were declared by the foreign trade authority to be comparatively the same as the United States.

ABANDON MUTUAL AGREEMENTS

Democratic leaders are vigorously fighting the MALONE proposal, chiefly because they contend it would mean a return to old reactionary methods of fixing tariffs and abandon the practice of entering into mutual agreements to help trade.

While many Southern Democrats are at odds with President Truman and oppose his nomination for a full term because of his stand on so-called civil rights, there is a virtual unanimity of feeling with respect to the reciprocal trade program which Cordell Hull successfully championed.

And today, George Marshall, who holds the Secretary of State's post occupied by Hull when the Reciprocal Trade Act became a law, feels that the plan "is the cornerstone and keystone of our foreign economic policy."

Yes, Republicans who charge that Dixie has continued to blindly vote Democratic might well consider the effect of the age-old GOP high-tariff policy upon the South.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGRATH obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Several Senators have asked me if there will be any further record votes today. I should like to say, as I did yesterday, that the desire is to conclude the consideration of the displaced persons bill tonight if possible. I see no reason why we cannot finish it. At least I am optimistic.

Let me state what we are up against in connection with the business of the Senate. If this bill shall go over, then, under the unanimous-consent order already entered, the time tomorrow until 3:30 o'clock will be allocated to the conference report on the so-called Bulwinkle bill. By unanimous consent the debate on the report will run from 12 to 3:30, and we would like very much, after that, if it shall meet with the approval of the Senate, to take up the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. There is also the measure extending the Second War Powers Act, in which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is intensely interested, and which he would like to have passed tomorrow if possible. So that program would make a pretty full day.

If the consideration of the pending bill shall not be completed today, it will mean carrying it over until Tuesday, and all Senators know that the draft bill is awaiting debate, and there are other pieces of major legislation. I should deeply appreciate the cooperation of Senators—and they have been very wonderful in their cooperation—in remaining here this evening to see if there will not be a chance to have the displaced persons bill passed. There are several amendments to be offered, and when we pick them all up they make quite a handful, but my feeling is that they will not all be offered, and the only way to find out about that is to remain here and vote.

I deeply appreciate the fact that Senators have been most cooperative, but we will have to continue to cooperate, and if we are to succeed in passing at an early date the pending bill we will have to have more cooperation even than we have had.

I know that some of the speeches to be made are important, and I beg Senators not to think for one moment that I am at all disparaging the addresses to come, because I know the ability of those who will participate in the debate, and appreciate the importance of the provisions which will be set forth in the substitute, and we all honor the distinguished Senator who is about to give us his version of the displaced persons bill.

After all the addresses have been concluded, Mr. President, we will have to start voting, and I at least would like to leave this word with my colleagues now, that it is the intention to finish the displaced persons bill tonight if possible. I ask Senators to remain here and use all the time necessary to complete their addresses as quickly as may be possible, and let us vote and dispose

of the bill sometime tonight, before Senators go to their homes, because tomorrow the Senate will recess until next Tuesday.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. Unfortunately I had to make this announcement just as he was about to begin his address, and I do not want him to feel at all that my remarks have been made at this particular time with the idea of any reflection upon the good offices of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. I well understand the problem confronting the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now ask that my amendment D be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield for the purpose suggested by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, beginning with line 10, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the period in line 14, and to insert in lieu thereof "visas issued pursuant to this act, shall, insofar as possible, be made available to each element or group among the displaced persons, as such elements or groups were segregated or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948, in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons, it being the purpose of this provision to insure, insofar as possible, that no discrimination in favor of or against any such element or group among the eligible displaced persons shall occur."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I send to the desk two amendments to the pending bill, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, while I am fully cognizant of the necessity for haste in the Senate from now on, and realize the urgency of coming to a vote as soon as possible on the bill before the Senate, together with the amendments which have been or will be proposed, I nonetheless believe it absolutely necessary, in order that we may all vote intelligently, that some of the issues presented by the proposed legislation be clarified, or perhaps I should say that the large number of issues which are not presented by the proposed legislation be eliminated before we attempt finally to make up our minds.

I shall not restate the affirmative case for the displaced-persons bill. This has been ably and thoroughly covered by

the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], both of whom have made an exceptionally thorough study and presentation of the matter, and by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], whose knowledge of the problem extends back to the earliest time at which America began to confront it, and whose grasp of it is not, I believe, surpassed by that of any other Member of this body. Support for legislation assisting displaced persons has also been given by the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I wish merely to associate myself with the affirmative case so made, and to pass on to the matter of analyzing what the true issues before us are as I see them.

In the first place, I wish to emphasize my entire agreement with the position of the Senator from Wisconsin when he says that we should not approach this problem in an emotional way which will obscure the facts and practicalities of the situation. In the year and a half since legislation was first proposed on the subject of displaced persons, a number of emotions have been evoked in discussions and have even found their way into certain legislative provisions. Not all these emotions are as creditable as the humanitarian concern for exiled fellow human beings against which we have been so eloquently urged to be on our guard. Among the other emotions which have entered into the discussion of the problem, I might list the following:

First, prejudice. It is entirely understandable that various groups within this country should feel a more direct concern with the plight of fellow members of their own group abroad than with others who may be in the same condition. I am happy to observe, however, that to my own personal knowledge the great welfare agencies representing these diverse groups have exhibited a real spirit of cooperation and mutual tolerance, with the result that the foreign-language groups and the great religious and welfare organizations, including those representing the Catholic and Protestant churches and the Jewish religion, have consistently and unanimously set their faces against any and all provisions which would discriminate in favor of or against any element or group among the displaced persons of Europe.

Unfortunately, this admirable spirit has not prevailed amongst some of those who have opposed this legislation. I know all of us have heard whispers to the effect that only this element or that element is interested, for its own selfish purposes, in helping displaced persons. I know all of us have heard it said that the displaced persons are all Communists, that they belong predominantly to one religious group, that they are all thieves, racketeers, or worthless derelicts. I shall not now take time to repeat the overwhelming refutation of all these charges which friends of this legis-

lation have had to repeat time and time over and over again—each time without the vestige of successful answer, but each time also only to see the same accusations arise again in different or disguised form. My purpose now is not to refute them, since they now need no further refutation. I merely wish to point out that the prejudice which gives rise to this sort of unfair and unwarranted attack on people helpless to defend themselves is an emotion against which we must all be constantly on our guard.

A second emotion which we must recognize and try to control in our dealings with this situation is one which has an impressive Latin name—xenophobia. That means the unreasoning fear and dislike of persons from other lands than our own, without regard to their individual merits. An emotional approach, based on this emotion, will clearly make rational consideration of our problem impossible.

The third and possibly the most important emotion which may well distort our whole approach to this, as to many other problems, is an exaggerated feeling of insecurity. No one can help being aware that the times in which we live are dangerous. The fate of the world is obviously less certain than it was before it had been disrupted by two great world wars. And it is to that extent insecure. That is not, however, a reason why the people of the greatest Nation of the world should approach the concrete problem that it must meet in an atmosphere of fear and hysteria. To be more specific, I am sure we all feel that there are grave uncertainties inherent in America's economic future. This, however, should not lead us to feel so insecure as to believe that the admission of 200,000 productive individuals into our Nation of 140,000,000 is going to disrupt our economy and render our citizens jobless and destitute. So, also, the very real menace to our interests which the present attitude of the Russian Government represents must not make us feel so insecure that we become incapable of discussing rational solutions for any problem once the opposition to such solutions has raised the bogey of communism.

For these reasons, I wish again to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his statesmanlike warning that this problem must not be approached solely on the basis of shallow emotionalism, and I wish to join him in urging that the issues that confront us be soberly and realistically analyzed on their merits.

Mr. President, if we are accurately and realistically to meet the problem before us, we must be constantly on our guard against a number of widely accepted misconceptions. For instance, ever since legislation to aid displaced persons was first suggested, a tremendous barrage of statistics has been laid down to show that we are practically dominated in this country already by a huge alien population. The most common figure cited is 6,000,000. Yesterday, on this floor, we heard the assertion that there were five or six million aliens now

in this country. The fact is, as was extensively testified to by the Commissioner of Immigration, that in June 1947 there were considerably less than 3,000,000 aliens in this country—a number which was then and had been for many years rapidly decreasing, as the people who were admitted in the unlimited immigration era of the last century grew old and died or attained naturalization.

Similar assertions related to an allegedly huge influx of illegal immigrants. This is not the time nor the place to examine in detail the mass of confusion and even misrepresentation which has surrounded this subject. I will say only this: Regardless of what the situation may have been before the war, the shipping since the war has made the task of coming to the United States or Mexico or Canada, legally and illegally, extremely difficult. When there is added to that difficulty the constantly increasing stringency of our own, as well as Canadian and Mexican, immigration enforcement, it makes entirely plausible the statement of the Commissioner of Immigration that illegal entries by persons who come from overseas have not in recent years exceeded a number in the very low hundreds annually. But I do not wish to spend time arguing the confused and confusing details which surround the general immigration problem. I do not believe we are prepared to discuss that problem, as we consider the bill before us, particularly, inasmuch as the subcommittee appointed to study it has admittedly not completed its study. I furthermore do not wish to discuss it at this point, because I do not believe it is relevant to the problem before the Senate.

I do not agree with the statement of the able Senator from West Virginia that this problem has a direct bearing on the immigration policy of this country. It was the plain determination of this body last year, at the time when Senate Resolution 137 was agreed to, that the question whether displaced persons should be admitted should be kept entirely separate from the question of general immigration policy; and I am sure that all the Senators present at that debate recall the stress which was put on the point that the legislation proposed for the admission of displaced persons was to be of a temporary emergency character and was not in any way to be construed as relaxing or in any way changing the general immigration policy of this country, until that policy is changed by a specific act of Congress.

Another thinly veiled suggestion which stands constantly in the way of a realistic attack on this problem is that there is substantial danger of Communist infiltration through bringing in displaced persons.

Mr. President, if I believed this for one moment, if I believed for one moment that there was even a slight danger of it, I should vigorously oppose their admission. But I do not believe it. I know it is not so. References to the possibility that the DP's constitute Communists, references both in the report of the subcommittee and in the statements on the

floor of this Chamber, are totally undocumented. At page 20 of the committee report I note particularly the following language:

The view was expressed, however, that a few Communists may be among the displaced persons.

The view was expressed. I can assure the Senate that the view has often been expressed that they were all Communists—not only a few. But the expression of that view does not make it a fact. I can also assure the Senate that nothing could be further from the truth, as testified to by the endorsements of the great Christian religious groups which are working in this country for the admission of their coreligionists under the plan now before us. These great church leaders are not Communists, and they are not interested in bringing Communists to our country. The very endorsement of this program is the finest guaranty we have or that we should need, that the people they will bring from the displaced persons camps are not Communists.

The incident recited on page 20 of the subcommittee report is illustrative and typical. It dealt with a situation in which official Russian propaganda agents could not even achieve a hearing in a displaced persons camp. As a matter of fact, the incident is somewhat understated. The fact is that the Russian agents barely escaped with their lives, due to the intercession of American military personnel.

Mr. President, the displaced people have lived closely together in homogeneous groups for a long time. No informed person denies that the overwhelming majority are violently anticommunistic and violently Christian. I do not believe, and I do not think that the persons directly responsible for their care over the past few years believe for one moment that Communists can infiltrate or have effectively infiltrated this group. I do believe, of course, that every precaution should and must be taken to see that they do not. But I feel strongly that to make unsupported insinuations the basis on which we shall or shall not pass adequate displaced persons legislation would be entirely unwarranted.

One final matter which has been mentioned several times, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, as somehow discrediting the efforts to make this legislation adequate is that of the pressure which it is said has been exerted on behalf of the displaced persons. To my mind the discreditable thing is not that there may have been such pressure, but that it should have been needed or thought to have been needed, for it is now three long years since the world and ourselves became aware of the plight of these unfortunate people, and they still await our constructive action.

I would agree that if misleading propaganda has been used, this would have been grounds for criticism against those who used it. It could not possibly be grounds for punishing the innocent people in whose behalf it may have been mistakenly used, if that were the case. But so far as I know, inaccurate propaganda on behalf of displaced persons has been held to a minimum.

The position of the proponents of displaced persons legislation is set forth in the greatest detail in the hearings before the House subcommittee last year. It is my impression that their testimony has since been substantiated by the firsthand observations of Members both of the House and of the Senate, including myself.

Both the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia have alluded to the fact that the displaced persons are relatively well-fed. They have told us that they are not kept behind barbed wire. Mr. President, I know these things to be true. I do not think that this detracts one iota from statements which have been made as to the miserable character of their existence. Even more strongly than I believe that stone walls do not a prison make, I believe that stone walls or barbed wire are not necessary to make a prison, to imprison a human soul. I think it is enough that these people are forced to remain homeless and cannot be self-supporting or engage in meaningful community life. I do not deem it more than a partial mitigation of their otherwise unbearable situation that they are fed at a minimum standard of reasonable subsistence and are not kept behind barbed wire.

One further point is worth mentioning in connection with the allegation about pressure. The major documentation for these allegations is an attack on the group sponsoring displaced persons legislation published a year ago by another group which has since changed its mind on the subject. All of the records relating to the supporting group have been meticulously filed under the Reorganization Act, and are fully available to Members of this body. Had those records been consulted, instead of the unofficial publication of a hostile organization, I am sure that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would not now include as a \$15,000 a year employee of the supporting group a man who was employed at that rate for approximately 2 weeks in the process of setting up the organization, nor a man who died in July 1947; nor would the list include, out of a total of 23 individuals, 15 who terminated their services on or before July 31, 1947.

My point here is not to defend this lobby or any other lobby. If my colleagues wish to investigate the wrongdoing of lobbyists, I shall give them my vigorous support, no matter whom it may affect. But let us not run the risk of punishing innocent displaced persons because such people as Owen J. Roberts, William Donovan, Edward Stettinius, and Virginia Gildersleeve wish to help them, or because the Catholic Church, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and the Jewish religious organizations, as well as more than 125 national organizations of the highest character wish to help them, and come here to exert their influence upon us. If these individuals and organizations, or if the more than 10,000 individual contributors to their cause have in any way engaged in improper lobbying—which I certainly would not defend if it were proved—that should not close our eyes to the true issue

before us. We should not close our eyes to that fact, but we should not visit punishment for it upon the displaced persons.

Such approaches are all negative. They are, to be sure, grounded on appeals to patriotism and to anticommunism. I think I am as patriotic, and I believe myself to be as anticommunistic, as anyone else; but my patriotism leads me to believe that the economic and social fiber of this great Nation of 140,000,000 people can survive the admission of a pitiful handful of useful, democratic people—200,000 in 2 years. I have faith, and I think the people of the United States have faith, that our country is capable of doing at least that, bringing them here under a law which is workable, and properly placing them.

My anticommunism makes me want to see this country triumph in solving a problem which we got into largely because of the inhumanity of those countries that subscribe to the ideals of communism.

Therefore, the true question is not, Can we do it? Of course we can. The question is, Should we? I say that we should, even if it might cause some minor inconvenience, as it must have caused to the devastated countries of Europe which have already done more in proportion than we now propose to do by any of the bills that are pending. They have done so in the face of the severest shortages of housing and even of food. But I know that the proposed admissions will not cause inconvenience to this country or to our people. I cannot bring myself to believe that the Nation-wide survey of the Catholic churches and the numerous State-wide surveys in which all churches have cooperated can be lightly tossed aside as inconclusive or half-heartedly done, or done in a spirit of deception of the Congress itself, simply because they have not prepared in advance of the passage of this legislation a list of the specific houses and the names of the specific factories to which people not yet selected might be assigned. I think, as the State survey committee from Wisconsin has stated, that once legislation is passed the question will be how a real, rather than an imaginary, problem can be met, and that there will be an overwhelming response from American people in all areas when the actual need is disclosed.

Mr. President, I wish to say only one thing further before I close these general remarks. There has appeared some apparent opposition to raising the ceiling figure in the bill to 200,000. I find myself completely unable to understand the arguments on which this opposition could be based. It was apparently thought that the admission of 200,000 persons in 2 years would hamper our economy and increase our housing difficulties. I am happy that since these remarks were in course of preparation, prior to the vote on the last amendment, the Senate by a very decisive vote has seen fit to face this issue and remove at least this defect from the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, as we proceed to the further consideration of the amendments which will make this proposed law work-

able, I hope we shall do so with an open mind and an open heart and in a true spirit of patriotism and love of our fellow man, in the realization that we are going to solve one of the human problems left by the war. I realize that the Senate has spent many days and nights in trying to meet the economic effects of the recent conflict. But, Mr. President, the human effects are more important. If the life of one of these persons is salvaged, if an opportunity is provided for one of these little families to start life anew, that is more important, to my way of thinking, to the future of our great American democracy than are the many millions of dollars which we appropriate for expenditure in the economic field.

There is perhaps no greater challenge before the Congress at this session than that we should do, by means of this legislation, the human and the godly thing of giving succor to those who are helpless, who stood by us in our hour of need, and whose principles are akin to ours, people who have been driven from their homes to temporary places of refuge, people who have suffered greatly and who, if they returned to their original homes, would be annihilated by those who are the enemies of our democracy no less than they are the enemies of these people themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered D, offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on the amendment lettered D, which has been offered by the Senator from Michigan.

As the bill now stands, it requires that at least 50 percent of the displaced persons admitted to the United States must come from countries which are classified as "annexed by a foreign power." Apparently that phrase refers to the three Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and to the portion of what was formerly Poland, east of the Curzon line.

On the other hand, the amendment requires the issuance of visas to all racial groups, based on the proportion which they may bear to the total number of displaced persons camps in the three western zones of Germany, Austria, and Italy on January 1, 1948.

The purpose of the amendment is simple. It requires the selection on a proportional formula which would allow a cross section of all groups to be admitted into the United States.

Based on the latest compiled figures of the occupational authorities and the PCIRO, the numbers of such persons in the camps in these zones on the dates specified in the amendment are as follows:

Balts, 126,000, or 23 percent of the total population.

Jews, 163,000, or 25½ percent.

Poles, 266,000, or 42 percent.

Yugoslavs, 22,000, or 3½ percent.

Russians, 4,000, or one-half of 1 percent.

All others, 34,000, or 5½ percent.

A total of 635,000.

The Senate has just adopted the amendment of the Senator from Michigan which increases the number to be admitted from 100,000 to 200,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the figures and percentages the Senator from Massachusetts has just presented. Let me ask about the date on which they are based, and let me also ask whether that is one of the dates the Senator has in mind in connection with the determination of whether the persons who entered those zones shall be considered to be displaced persons.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These figures are based on the date January 1, 1948. My argument is based on the theory that the amendment which also is to be offered, which would change the date from December 1945 to April 21, 1947, will be adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That was the purpose of my inquiry, because the estimates and figures given are not premised on the practice which existed until quite recently, when, under the Presidential directive, such persons were not considered to be displaced persons unless they had entered those zones prior to December 22, 1945.

So the Senator's estimates are based upon a recently extended date; namely, April 21, 1947.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was the date, as I understand, and as I think the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me, when General Clay closed the camps to further admissions of displaced persons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know what the date is based upon. But as a matter of fact, it is an extension by approximately a year and a half beyond the date fixed by the Presidential directive of December 22, 1945.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And it is premised upon an amendment to be offered later.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is not premised upon any of the terms of the committee bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is based on an amendment to be offered later, an amendment which the Senator from Massachusetts thought would be offered before this amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the total number of displaced persons to be admitted into the United States is 200,000, then under the amendment I am now discussing there could be admitted to the United States 46,000 Balts, 51,000 Jews, 84,000 Poles, 7,000 Yugoslavs, 1,000 Russians, and 11,000 persons from all other groups.

I wish to emphasize the point that our amendment simply fixes a ceiling in regard to the number of persons of each

group who could be admitted. The amendment does not require that that number of persons be admitted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to ask the Senator about the figures he has presented. Who would be the persons who would be limited to 11,000 in number. From what nationality groups would they come?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The break-down by nationalities in connection with the group entitled "Others and unclassified" is based on a list consisting of the nationals of approximately 25 countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. For instance, Mr. President, would Czechoslovakia come within the group of 11,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They would come within that group.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, the people from Czechoslovakia would be included within that limited number and would have to share that number with the nationals of other countries; is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. For instance, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden are among the countries included in the list.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator say that there are any people from Switzerland who are properly classified as displaced persons?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator that this is the classification which, as I understand, meets the classification used by the PCIRO for the classification of groups; and within the figure under the heading "Others," which is the term used to identify this group in the classification, are some of these countries. I do not for one moment say there are any Swiss in the displaced persons camps, but I say that Switzerland is included in this group, which is an international classification, I presume.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point I make is that the Senator now is proposing to change the immigration laws. He is not now dealing with displaced persons.

Let me ask the Senator whether citizens of Holland and of Denmark are included in the group to which he has referred.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Denmark is included in this list, and the Netherlands also is included. I do not say there are any displaced persons from those two countries.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the point I make. There are no displaced persons from the Netherlands or from Denmark, both of which countries now have their own free governments reestablished. Likewise, there are no displaced persons from Switzerland. When the Senator from Massachusetts argues for a plan which would include the nationals of those countries, under a new bill, a bill dealing with a subject separate and apart from the displaced persons question, he is dealing with the immigration question, is he not, and not with the displaced-persons problem? I ask that question most respectfully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to the Senator from West Virginia, with equal respect, that this term, as I understand it, includes all the different classifications of nationals who may be in the displaced-persons camps. That does not necessarily mean that it will change the immigration quotas for various countries, when people from those countries are not in the displaced-persons camps.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But it does mean, does it not, that 11,000 persons are to be admitted, under the Senator's bill, under his break-down of the figures, and under the amendment, some of whom will come from Switzerland, some from Denmark, and some from the Netherlands? We know as a matter of fact that there is no such thing as a displaced person from those countries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the point I want to make with respect to the bill as framed by the committee. There are some 10,000,000 displaced persons known as the Volksdeutsche, who are not covered by the bill. There are said to be some 10,000,000 in Pakistan. They are not only in Europe but in north Africa and the Middle East as well. The Senator is reaching out to include those who are not displaced persons, even in those categories. He is taking nationals of Switzerland and of the Netherlands and of Denmark, putting them into a displaced-persons bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully disagree with the statement just made by the Senator from West Virginia. What I tried to say was that there is an international classification, and if any DP is of one of those nationalities, he would come within that small group.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator prefaced his remarks, as I recall, by saying that if 200,000 are to be admitted there will be so many of one nationality and so many of another, and it then comes down to those who are unclassified, of which he said 11,000 would be admitted. He then mentioned the nationals of Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark as being among those included within the 11,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I named those countries as being within the international classification. I did not say there were persons of those nationalities in displaced-persons camps.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Who is going to fill the ranks of the 11,000, if it is broken down to those countries, in which we know there are no displaced persons? I refer to Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator misunderstands the purpose of the amendment. The amendment simply makes use of the term "others" as one of the six classifications of displaced persons of whom 11,000 may be admitted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe the interpretation of the amendment which has been suggested by my good friend the Senator from West Virginia is a correct interpretation and I think that a study of the provisions of the bill will bear out my statement. The amendment merely provides that any quota we fix for admission of "eligible displaced persons" shall be distributed among groups and nationalities as those groups and nationalities are designated by the International Refugee Organization.

The significant words are the words "Eligible displaced persons." Who are the eligible displaced persons described in S. 2242, which is the committee bill? They are not persons from the nations of which the Senator from West Virginia had spoken.

Section 2 of S. 2242 defines a displaced person in part as follows:

(b) "Displaced person" means any displaced person or refugee as defined in annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization and who is the concern of the International Refugee Organization.

Turning to annex I of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization we find that displaced persons must have been—

(a) victims of the Nazi or Fascist regimes or of regimes which took part on their side in the Second World War.

I think the Senator would agree with me that the amendment simply provides a method of distributing the quota that will be admitted, and does not change the definition of "eligible displaced persons." The Senator's amendment certainly does not mean that people are to be brought in who have never been considered as displaced persons. The committee bill itself says that only those who are "eligible displaced persons" shall be admitted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are two definitions. One is a displaced person under the definition of the International Refugee Organization constitution. The other is what is known as an eligible displaced person, defined as one who may enter under this bill. To merely use the definition of a displaced person, as defined by the Organization, which definition the Senator has read, would result in the inclusion of people from all over the world, whose displacement was not the result of the Nazi persecutions, but which had occurred prior to the late war, and refugees of that class.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has nothing to do with the definition of eligible displaced persons. It does not change the definition contained in the bill in any way. It merely says that once the quota of eligible displaced persons has been filled, then they shall be distributed among all groups as named by the IRO. Nothing could be added to the definition of eligible displaced persons. That could not be changed. Only eligible displaced persons could be accepted, but they must be distributed according to

groups and nationalities named by the IRO.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the bill were unchanged, we would understand the meaning of eligible displaced persons. But remember, it is contemplated, and the Senator from Massachusetts has said he based his statement upon it, that by another amendment there will be extended the time limit within which persons may be considered for entry into this country as eligible displaced persons, changing the date from December 22, 1945 to April 21, 1947. The Senator from Massachusetts further stated, breaking down those figures, who they would be. If I mistake not, he said that of the total of 200,000, 11,000 were unclassified. He then named the countries coming within the nonclassified group. That is what I took up, pointing out that it would include Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Denmark. I wondered how he could consider any of the nationals of those countries as displaced persons.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator. I do not believe we could consider them, even if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Kentucky heard the Senator from Massachusetts make the statement that they are in the list.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator from West Virginia—and I know his thorough understanding of the bill—if he believes that the amendment, which goes merely to the distribution of those who are selected, could possibly result in bringing into this country any persons other than eligible displaced persons as defined in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, it could not, but the Senator will realize that a change in that definition is now being contemplated.

Mr. COOPER. I do not understand that it is being changed in any way by this amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not by this amendment; but did not the able Senator from Kentucky hear the able Senator from Massachusetts say that later he planned to offer an amendment which would change the definition?

Mr. COOPER. It would extend the time, but it would not change in any way the definition as far as it goes to the persons who could be considered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to say anything more on this subject?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to make one statement. It certainly would extend the classification of persons either by country or according to whether they had been displaced forcibly, whether they were known as infiltrates or refugees. It would certainly change the definition to that extent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to answer the question a little further, in order to make clear what I tried to say, that this classification merely includes persons who are in the displaced-persons

camps as listed by the PCIRO. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the statistical report on PCIRO operations, dated February 1948. That report shows the refugees receiving PCIRO care and maintenance on February 29, 1948, by PCIRO location, and by country of citizenship, as well as residence or ethnic group.

Those are the ones I have tried to point out are in the displaced persons camps.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator does not consider every refugee a displaced person, does he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky said, that this amendment does not enlarge the classification in any way, shape, or form. It merely makes a different quota from the quota submitted by the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would not the Senator's amendment, if agreed to, destroy the preference given to persons already in camps?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, is there anything in the Senator's amendment which would preserve the priority of persons who are in displaced-persons camps over those who are outside and living under the general economy of the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not change it in any way at all; it merely would change the quotas, as submitted by the committee, and provide a different formula.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I invite the Senator's attention to that very point, because I am impressed with the thought that it would change the preference given by the committee's bill to displaced persons who are in camps.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully state that to the best of my knowledge it does not change the preference.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that our amendment simply fixes a ceiling on the number in each group that may be admitted. It does not require that the group be taken. As the Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, one of the requirements for eligibility is that the displaced persons be qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for permanent residence.

Under the present language of the bill, without our amendment, two priorities must be met. First, 50 percent of the displaced persons must be from the three Baltic states or east of the Curzon line, which was formerly part of Poland, as their place of origin. That feature I have already briefly discussed.

Secondly, 50 percent must be farmers. Under the bill in its present form, both these priorities could be met by the same persons. In other words, a man who is a farmer and who comes from one of the three Baltic states or east of the Curzon line could be admitted and both priorities would be covered.

We must realize that the group from east of the Curzon line contains the largest percentage of farmers, 33 percent, or 44,500 in all. Only 7 percent of

the Baltic group, or 11,000, and 4 percent of the Jewish group, or 6,500, are listed as farmers. Carrying this a step further, it simply means, under the administration of the proposed act as now written, these priorities could be covered by admitting 50,000 Poles and Balts from those areas. This would mean, logically, that the selection of the other 50,000 displaced persons to make up the total of 100,000, as originally in the bill, would be left entirely to discretion. This might mean that 50,000 of the 100,000 to be admitted under the bill might come from one racial group or could be arbitrarily apportioned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table which illustrates three possible hypothetical distributions.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Distribution of 100,000 immigrants under the bill as reported

	Possibility A, annexed areas and farmers	Possibility B	Possibility C
Balts.....	1 10,000	50,000	5,000
Jews.....	2 50,000		
Poles.....	1 40,000	50,000	45,000
Soviets.....			50,000
Yugoslavs.....			
Others.....			
Total.....	100,000	100,000	100,000

¹ Both priorities of 50 percent from annexed areas and 50 percent farmers can be met by taking 50,000 persons from annexed areas, leaving the remaining 50,000 to be distributed as the Federal officials see fit.

² Estimates of the number of Jewish displaced persons in camps on Dec. 22, 1945, and still there on Jan. 1, 1948, vary from 10,000 to 50,000. For the purposes of illustrating my point in this table, I am therefore taking the top figure of 50,000 Jewish displaced persons who could be eligible under the bill as it stands.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In short, the Commission could admit, we will say, 10,000 Balts and 40,000 Poles to cover the first two 50 percent priority requirements, and then could admit at its discretion 50 percent Jews. Another possibility could be 50,000 Balts, 50,000 Poles, and no Jews at all, or any combination of those three figures.

The purpose of our amendment is an effort to give all segments of these unsettled peoples a fair break. It would also place definite, fixed ceilings on the number in each group that could be admitted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand the Senator's remarks, a man or a woman of German ethnic origin could still continue to be barred from this country. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is as I understand, because persons belonging to the German ethnic group are not considered to be displaced persons, so far.

Mr. LANGER. Under the definition of the PCIRO?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I understand.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think that is right?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it is the most practical definition, I would say to

the Senator, that we can adopt at the present time.

Mr. LANGER. Knowing the Senator from Massachusetts as I do, I have always thought that he was opposed to discrimination of any kind or character.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope I am.

Mr. LANGER. Why, then, should we discriminate against men or women of German ethnic origin?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I believe we should do at the present time is to try to solve the problem of displaced persons in camps. They are now a great responsibility. They are a continuing responsibility, and unless we take steps to end the situation it will grow worse and worse. This amendment is a step in the right direction.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator not know that the investigation by the Judiciary Committee disclosed that approximately 1,323,000 so-called displaced persons are not in camps, not behind barbed wire, but are going around the same as anyone else?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been to four displaced-persons camps. I know that there are no bars, no gates, or anything of that kind, and the people are free to move in the community.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator realize that ten million or more persons of German ethnic origin are in desperate condition in Europe, are much worse off than the so-called displaced persons, and that, as a matter of fact, four or five millions of them have already died?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the Senator's question from factual knowledge, and I cannot make comparisons. I saw many people who I thought were extremely hungry and were very badly clothed. Whether they were worse off or better off than some other group I would not be competent to say.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to thank the Senator, and I hope I am not interrupting him too much. In the written amendment which the Senator has offered I believe the language has reference to such elements or groups as are selected or designated for the purpose of being cared for by the International Refugee Organization as of January 1, 1948. Would there not be some conflict?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We took that part of the amendment from the Senator's own bill, on line 16, page 4, and we did not change it at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean to say that he took that language from the committee bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no. My amendment does not strike out the language in the bill which runs from line 14 on page 4 to line 22 on page 4. It merely strikes out the language from line 10 to line 14.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point I am making is that the Senator in the written language of his amendment uses the date January 1, 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the language used in the pending bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the committee bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Where?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 4, line 16. I will quote those two lines to the Senator:

Priority in the issuance of visas shall be given to those eligible displaced orphans and eligible displaced persons who were on January 1, 1948, located in displaced persons camps and centers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Located in displaced persons camps, but not as segregated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like also to call the Senator's attention to what the Senator from New Jersey has just reminded me, namely, that the same date is used in the committee bill on page 2, line 7.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was used as to those in camps on January 1, 1948, but in the Senator's amendment it is said, "in the proportion that the number of displaced persons in such element or group bears to the total number of displaced persons as of January 1, 1948." There is a great difference between using the date January 1, 1948, as to those who were in camps on that date and then using it as in the Senator's amendment, as to the proportions they bore to each group.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My understanding is that these camps were closed by General Clay on April 21, 1947. Between that date and January 1, 1948, some of the DP's went out of the camps. For instance, as the Senator himself said, some went to Belgium, some to England, and some elsewhere. As I understand the purpose of the amendment and what we are asked to do, is to take the number of persons who were in these camps on January 1, 1948, and give them quotas based on the percentage of population.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has again stated the date of April 21, 1947, as the date when General Clay closed the entries into the camps. I know that is correct, under an order that was entered when the Army had charge of the camps. There were very definite exceptions made called hardship cases, and I believe the Senator will find upon inquiry that thousands have come in. In other words, it has been said that as soon as one group goes out others come in. Since July 1, 1947, General Clay has not had control of these camps, and it is regrettable that he has not had. It is under the PCIRO. The old UNRRA group is running them. The camp teams are former UNRRA employees. I say that it is regrettable, because I saw two camps which continued to be operated by the Army, and it is regrettable for the people who lived in the camps that the Army ever gave up control of any of them.

Be that as it may, when the Senator says that General Clay closed the camps on April 21, 1947, I think the Senator will find upon inquiry, and find it very readily, that the gates of those camps are still open to people who desire to enter

them. It has been said time and again that as people go out others come in.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I visited four of those camps. I think I visited two of them, either in the Senator's company or just after he did. I know, as he knows, that some of them are in much better shape than others, and I know, as he knows, that the discipline in some of them is much better than in others. Unquestionably some people have filtered in illegally, just as they filter in illegally anywhere. But I do not think that was done to such an extent that it is unfair to base these quotas on the number who were in the camps on January 1, 1948.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has spoken of the infiltrates, that is, the people who have come in.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said filtered in illegally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Some illegally and some legally.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They all have come in illegally, have they not?

Mr. REVERCOMB. There are what are called "hardship cases" which the authorities let in, and I find that is a very broad term in the camps. If people are hungry, of course, they are hardship cases. But they are there.

The Senator has mentioned a word which I am very glad he did, namely, "infiltrate." Under the Senator's amendment he is going to give some preference of consideration to infiltrates and refugees who came in a long time after the war as against the real displaced person who was forced out of his country and compelled to work by the Nazi Government. The Senator is putting them on the same level.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I answer the Senator from West Virginia in this way: We have to look at this problem, as at all other problems resulting from the war, as optimistically as we can, first, in the interest of the United States; second, in the interest of humanity; third, in the interest of justice. I agree with the Senator that more people have infiltrated into the camps, but even if they have, if we are to act on the displaced persons problem in the camps, we have to make a start, we have to use some date as a basis on which to figure quotas.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Using the excellent formula just expressed, of justice and fairness—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I place first what is for the best interest of the United States; second, humanity; and third, justice.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Using that good formula, and knowing that we cannot take them all, and are not attempting to take them all—and I am sure that the Senator does not insist that we take all those who may be in displaced persons camps—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator think it meets the interests of the country, certainly meets the high standards of humanity, and meets the high standards of justice, if we take those people who cannot return home, and who were forced out as laborers, who have been longest in the camps, and give them a little preference over those who since

the war was over, and even up to this time, have come over the borders into the American zone? Does not the Senator think there should be a preference given, and does it not meet the standards of humanity and justice to give that preference?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from West Virginia will bear with me for 2 or 3 minutes, perhaps I shall be able to answer his question satisfactorily, and completely convince him, I hope, that he is wrong.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota whether he is going to speak on the pending amendment. I should like to have a chance to have a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. LANGER. There is no chance to reach a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator any idea how long we would have to remain in session?

Mr. LANGER. I expect to speak for several hours.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me inquire of the Senator from West Virginia whether he is disposed to make a prediction as to whether we might get a vote on the amendment tonight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not see any reasonable chance for a vote on the amendment tonight, no.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course we want to comply with the requests of all Senators. I had hoped we might at least get this one amendment out of the way.

Let me inquire of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether he is going to speak on the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my intention.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know of any other Senator on his side of the aisle who would like to speak on it?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the fact that we are attempting to come to a conclusion of the pending legislation, I wonder if the proponents and opponents would be ready to consider a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on all amendments and the bill on next Tuesday, let us say. I do not care to advance the request before the group of distinguished Senators who are interested primarily in the subject, especially the members of the committee, feel that the debate may be nearing a conclusion. I will ask the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from West Virginia whether they consider it would be of any service to submit a unanimous-consent request tonight that a vote be taken on the amendment sometime next Tuesday?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not think it would do any good.

Mr. WHERRY. What does the Senator from West Virginia say?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I would say that such a request made at the present time would not be worth while. There are some 16 or 17 amendments yet to be considered. I think at this point in the procedure it is hardly worth while to make the request for the purpose stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to say that while I think everyone has cooperated in trying to secure the passage of the bill, I must call attention to the fact that, although it has been or is supposed to have been the unfinished business for some time, it has, from time to time, been set aside for consideration of other matters, and now, according to the acting majority leader, we will be compelled to put further consideration of it over from today until Tuesday. It has been said that after the matter which will be taken up tomorrow is concluded, it is proposed to proceed to consider an appropriation bill. So it will be at least Tuesday before we can again return to consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. Then, if two or three more days are consumed as might very well happen, by legitimate debate, and other appropriation bills should be taken up, the time when action on this measure can be had is hardly in sight.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico in pointing out the possible situation. In defense of Senators who have the pending bill in charge I may say that the Senate has been obliged from time to time to lay it aside temporarily and take up other matters, as all Senators know. That has been most disconcerting. It is difficult to come back to the consideration of a bill which has been interrupted from time to time. I think there are 16 amendments yet to be acted upon, but I thought that possibly we might secure a vote on most of the committee amendments.

In line with the idea set forth by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, may I ask whether those in charge of the bill, as well as its opponents, would be agreeable to setting an hour, let us say on next Wednesday, when we might vote on the amendments then pending, and on final passage of the bill? I believe that if we can agree upon some hour we can secure quick action upon the bill. We must consider the schedule for next week. It is proposed that we consider the draft legislation, and it would be well, if we can do so, to take it up before adjourning from tomorrow until next Tuesday. I appeal to those in charge of the bill to entertain a unanimous consent request at least to vote at an hour on Wednesday of next week which is agreeable to them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator, if he is addressing the question to me—

Mr. WHERRY. I am addressing it to all Senators interested in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say that I desire to cooperate. For more than a week now, from time to time, other business has been taken up, while the bill which is now before the Senate has been laid aside. The leadership has told me from time to time how important it has been to proceed with other matters. Tomorrow two subjects are to be taken up, for which the pending bill is to be set

aside. I do not think it is proper at this time even to consider any future hour at which a vote shall be taken.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps it is best not to press for an agreement at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, the Senator from Massachusetts has the floor. If he will permit me, I will say we shall certainly continue in session today until he has completed his speech. We shall do as much as we can tonight. But I feel that the Members of the Senate should be advised of the situation so they may judge what we shall have to do, not only during the remainder of today, but on next Tuesday and next Wednesday.

Mr. President, in order properly to apportion the time for the remainder of the session, if we are to adjourn on June 19 we must have some idea of when the major pieces of legislation shall be brought up. I had hoped that if the pending bill had to be carried over until next week we might at least fix some hour on next Tuesday or next Wednesday when we might vote on the amendments then pending and on final passage of the bill. I do not want to press the distinguished Senator from West Virginia any further. We have laid aside the bill several times, and, as I previously said, that has been disconcerting to all of us.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish only to make a facetious remark, which it is not necessary to make; but I will say that if we continue to act as we have on this proposed legislation, I shall suggest that the title of the bill be amended to read "The displaced bill relating to displaced persons."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is in charge of the various amendments we have offered, and I say with assurance that I speak his mind, that the proponents of the amendments will be glad to vote on them at any time, and will be glad to make any reasonable agreement as to when to vote.

Mr. WHERRY. May I again propound to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia the question whether he would consider a unanimous-consent request, in view of the attitude of the proponents of the amendments, relative to the time, either on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, or any other day next week, when a vote might be had.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the able Senator that I have tried to make myself quite clear and to be fair on the subject. I do not want to enter into any agreement at this time, in view of the number of amendments pending, and those which will be proposed, as I am advised.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The proponents of the amendments have consumed practically all of the time that has been spent

on the bill. The opponents have not had opportunity to avail themselves of much time on them.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in any way condemning or condoning. I am simply trying to expedite the legislation. We have been very successful, I believe, in the legislative program so far this year, and the only way to secure a unanimous-consent agreement is to submit it. I have done my level best. I am inclined to believe that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has gone as far as he can go. So at an appropriate time I shall again submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Nebraska has spoken of the large amount of legislation which lies ahead of us, and particularly the work which will come before us during the next week. I call attention to the fact that General MacArthur will be here next week. That will take additional time of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard a statement made to that effect. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for reminding the Senate that General MacArthur is expected to return here next week.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. It is not quite clear in the mind of the Senator from New York whether we are to have more votes tonight on amendments. I should like to have that point made clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I speak the view of the Senator from Nebraska when I say that when the Senator from Massachusetts has concluded his remarks, which will require about 5 minutes if he is not interrupted, nothing further will be done by way of voting tonight. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. WHERRY. As I said before, I have been very optimistic that we could secure a vote but when the Senator from Massachusetts has concluded his speech tonight, and when he has engaged in colloquy with other Senators, or answered questions they may desire to ask of him, it will be my purpose to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at noon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the purpose of our amendment is to give all segments of these unsettled peoples a fair break. It would also place definite fixed ceilings on the numbers of each group who could be admitted. Under our amendment we will know within close limits exactly the racial groups that we may expect. We do not have that knowledge under the bill as it now stands because the Commission may well have a free rein in the selection of one-half of the total number to be admitted.

Under the present language of the bill, two groups, it seems to me, are not treated fairly. There are few farmers among the Jews—only about 4 percent and only a small percentage of them originated from areas now considered by the bill as annexed areas.

Moreover, there is a group of the Roman Catholic faith who come from west of the Curzon line, and these could not be admitted in fair numbers since preference is given to the Baltic states, where the Protestant faith is in the majority.

It seems to me that an equitable opportunity for resettlement must be given to all groups and elements. It is a much more practical approach. In the United States today there are racial groups similar to those represented among these displaced persons. Their origins are in the same areas. Their nationalities are the same. These citizens of ours have a particular concern and interest in their corresponding groups in the displaced persons' camps. If we are desirous of having a wide distribution of these people throughout our land, their distribution, as well as their rehabilitation, will, in large measure, be dependent upon the assistance of local citizens, communities, and agencies. Local volunteers among our citizens must be enthusiastic if this program is to be successful. If those admitted are equitably chosen on a percentage basis then we shall have a better chance to stimulate the required support and the coordinated efforts of all local, State and national groups.

Let me now point out one fact which I believe the committee has not considered carefully enough. The present bill uses the words whose place of origin or country of nationality has been annexed by a foreign power. In this country today we have representatives of the former independent states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Our Government has clearly refused to admit that those countries have been annexed. While it is obvious that the Soviet Union is at present exercising sovereignty over those countries, our country does not recognize that fact. Therefore, it seems to me to be embarrassing not only to their representatives in this country, but to us as a Nation to designate the displaced persons of those nationalities as coming from a country which has been annexed to a foreign power until that fact has been officially recognized by our Government.

I am not a member of the Judiciary Committee, but my interest in this subject comes from the simple fact that there are many people not only in Massachusetts, but in every other State in the Union, who are vitally interested in this humanitarian problem. Because of their interest and because of the great human problem involved, I have tried to understand this question and to help in any way that I could. Last autumn I visited some of these camps. I have talked with officers of our Armed Forces who have been in charge of them. I believe that there are many persons who will become valuable citizens among the displaced persons at the present time. I recognize, as we all do, that there are some who could not properly and helpfully be brought to this country. That hard core, as it is called, will be a problem of the United Nations or some other international group for many years to come, but that hard core should be made as small as it is reasonable to make it.

Our purpose in passing this bill is to have the United States undertake its share of responsibility in this great international program caused by the war. Certainly any admissions that we make should be scrutinized carefully. They should not be permitted to displace our citizens from homes or from positions, but today there are positions on the farms and in industries where these people can qualify and where they are needed. I hope sincerely that their number may be increased from 100,000 to 200,000—this has already been done—and that they may be brought in on a basis that is equitable to all who are now in the camps, rather than on a basis which could leave the solution largely to the discretion of an administering agency.

Every Member of the Senate has citizens in his constituency from these nationalities of whom they are proud. These people are proud of their descent. They have a love of their former homeland. They will be glad to help restore to greater security and give greater opportunity to qualified persons who have for many years suffered so much and who have had so little chance to enjoy the ordinary decencies of life which we take as a matter of course.

I hope, Mr. President, that in due course this amendment may be adopted and that a fair bill may be passed.

Mr. President, I should like to add one further comment. The Senator from West Virginia questioned me as to whether there were any citizens of Danish descent in the DP camps. I have checked up with the Army representative on the question of DP camps, and he states over the telephone that there are Danes married to DP's, and that those married persons are in the camps. So I answer the question in that way.

Mr. President, I hope the bill may ultimately become law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was the plan of those sponsoring these amendments that I should follow at this time in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I shall not do so today because of the lateness of the hour. However, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his able presentation of our point of view on this amendment. There is very little that I can add, but I shall do it when we resume debate on this subject by way of supplementing what the Senator from Massachusetts has said.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a petition which I have received upon the subject of displaced persons, including the names signed thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 15, 1948.

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned, representing many millions of American citizens, call upon the Congress to enact at the earliest possible date legislation authorizing entry into the United States of a just proportion of the displaced persons.

We are heartened that the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported favorably a

bill, S. 2242, dealing with this subject. However, it is our sincere conviction that S. 2242 in its present form does not offer an adequate solution to the problem and that it discriminates against great masses of the displaced persons.

Our organizations have consistently advocated the admission of 100,000 displaced persons a year over a 4-year period. We still hope that this may prove possible. At the very least, we ask you to support such amendments to S. 2242 as will enable the United States to admit 200,000 displaced persons over a 2-year period and a proportionate cross-section of such persons without discrimination as to national origin or religious faith.

We believe that this is the minimum that the United States can and should do in order to discharge its responsibility as a leading world power and as the traditional haven for those oppressed by the tyrannies of other lands.

Respectfully,

Roger N. Baldwin, American Civil Liberties Union; Maurice Bilsger, Executive Secretary, B'nai B'rith; Mrs. J. D. Bragg, President, Women's Division of Christian Service, the Methodist Church; Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Mrs. Alfred Chapman, Chairman, National Executive Board, Women's Auxiliary National Council of Protestant Churches; Edward Corsi, President, American Federation of International Institutes; Mrs. Stanley G. Cook, Chairman on Legislation, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Nathan Cowan, Legislative Director, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Mary Margaret Mannix, President, National Council of Catholic Women; Mark Dauber, Executive Secretary, Home Missions Council of North America; Miss Mary C. Duffy, Supreme Regent, Catholic Daughters of America; William G. Gadt, President, National Lutheran Council; Ray Gibbons, Director, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches; Rev. L. W. Goebel, D. D., President, Evangelical and Reform Church; Leon Henderson, Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; Paul Howard, Director, National Relations Office, American Library Association; Miss Helen G. Irwin, Legislative Chairman, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; Mrs. Jonas W. Irwin, Washington Representative, National Board, Y. W. C. A. of U. S. A.; Read Lewis, Executive Director, Common Council for American Unity; Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Kirtley S. Mather, President, Eugene E. Barnett, General Secretary, National Council of YMCA; Dr. William G. Mather, Chairman, Northern Baptist Convention, Council on Christian Social Progress; John McDowell, Executive Director, National Federation of Settlements; Mrs. Lucy Milligan, President, National Council of Women; Tom R. Owens, Legislative Representative, United Rubber Workers; Chat Pateron, National Chairman, American Veterans Committee; James G. Patton, President, National Farmers Union; Rev. Almon R. Pepper, Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Relations, National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches; Leslie S. Perry, Washington Representative, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Dr. Paul N. Poling, Secretary, Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church of

the U. S. A.; Jacob S. Potofsky, President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Joseph M. Proskauer, President, American Jewish Committee; Esther A. Richards, Secretary, Universalist Church of America; Abraham Rockmore, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; Mrs. Rose Rohman, President, National Catholic Women's Union; Lessing J. Rosenwald, President, American Council for Judaism; Philip Schiff, National Jewish Welfare Board; Rose Schneiderman, President, National Women's Trade Union League; Mrs. Annalee Stewart, President, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Anna Lord Strauss, President, League of Women Voters of the U. S.; Marjorie L. Temple, Legislative Program Associate, American Association of University Women; Mrs. Theodore Wedel, Chairman, Department of Christian Social Relations, United Council of Church Women; Bernard Weitzer, National Legislative Representative, Jewish War Veterans; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Mrs. Norman De R. Whitehouse, Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace; Ray Wilson, Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Dr. Stephen S. Wise, President, American Jewish Congress.

PROPOSED BUREAU OF ASYLUMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take 2 or 3 minutes to comment on an entirely different subject. I make these comments on the basis of my conviction that confession is good for the soul.

I direct my remarks to a bill which I introduced on May 20, Senate bill 2711, having to do with Federal inspection of mental hospitals in instances in which State hospitals receive funds by way of Federal aid.

I introduced this bill as a matter of courtesy to a group which has been working long and hard on the general problem of seeking to improve the administration of mental hospitals and the care of patients therein. It was my understanding that the bill had been checked with counsel. In the rush of events which is the experience of every Member of the Senate, I myself did not take the time to analyze the bill. However, I made it clear to those who asked me to introduce it that I would do so only as an act of courtesy. Frequently we introduce legislation which does not necessarily carry with it our endorsement as individual Senators. I frankly confess for the record that I had not analyzed the draftsmanship of the bill. My attention was called to an obvious error or two in the draftsmanship, so I sent the bill to the legislative counsel and asked for a review of it, only to find that my office had previously asked for the opinion of the legislative counsel, which I had not seen, but which was sent to me under date of April 8.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from a memorandum which I received from the legislative counsel on Senate bill 2711.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR MORSE

This is in reply to your request for our opinion on the request of Miss Friedman that you sponsor legislation establishing a Federal Bureau of Asylums.

As you know, Congress has no authority under the Constitution to legislate over matters which are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the States and State insane asylums fall within that exclusive State jurisdiction.

The only way the Federal Government can exercise control over State asylums is by a constitutional amendment, except that some limited control could be exercised where Congress appropriates money to the States to help maintain and operate State asylums with a condition that the States must agree to certain Federal controls or else they would not get the money. This type of control is subject to two possible practical objections:

First, many Members of Congress object to imposing indirect controls on the States as a condition precedent to receiving necessary Federal aid.

Second, unless the amount of the appropriation is very large, it is doubtful that the States would be induced to submit to the Federal controls suggested by Miss Friedman.

It would seem to this writer, who admittedly has no expert knowledge of the conditions existing in State insane asylums, that in a matter of this kind which is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the several States, the proper procedure to be followed in improving the conditions that are alleged to exist today would be through the State governors or the State legislatures.

Respectfully yours,

S. E. RICE.

APRIL 8, 1948.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the bill as originally introduced would not meet constitutional tests. I so discovered upon my examination of the bill subsequent to its introduction. Therefore, I am submitting a redraft of the bill today, though I am not endorsing even the redraft. However, the redraft, I believe, at least eliminates the unconstitutional feature of the bill as originally introduced.

I wish the RECORD clearly to show that my only interest in this matter is to use the bill as a courtesy vehicle for calling to the attention of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the need and importance of the committee proceeding in the next session of Congress to look into the whole question of the relationship between the Federal Government and mental hospitals which receive any Federal funds whatsoever.

I am in sympathy with the general objectives of the bill, but I want the RECORD to show that I am serving clear notice on my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that I am satisfied that the bill will require complete redrafting and revision, possibly by way of a committee bill, after the necessary investigations are made by the committee. I believe that such investigations will have to be made by any committee which studies the subject matter of the bill.

I do not need to tell the Senate that the treatment of mental patients in this country and the inadequate support which is given to mental hospitals generally is not a pleasant record for Americans who take the time to ascertain the facts. The amount of mental illness in the United States is very large, and I am afraid that many of us who enjoy good health are quite guilty of oversight of the thousands of our more unfortunate brethren who find themselves in mental hospitals and in some instances in hospitals where it would be more appropriate to refer to their status as that of in-

carceration, rather than that of sick persons being treated as patients.

I recognize that the Federal Government cannot and should not take over the jurisdiction of the treatment of mental patients. I am as much opposed to Federal administration of hospitals involving the mental sick as I am opposed to Federal administration and control of so-called general hospitals involving patients ill with other types of sickness. Yet I think we need to recognize that in some parts of the United States we could quite legitimately and properly supply Federal aid to some State hospitals, so as to eliminate some of the very undesirable conditions which exist in many of the mental hospitals. In fact, I think it is proper to say that the year 1700 is quite an appropriate year to cite by way of comparison in describing the treatment which exists in some sections of the United States, so far as mental patients are concerned. In many parts of our country we have not progressed very far beyond 1700 in the treatment of mental patients.

So, Mr. President, I think it is quite proper for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have this bill on file and to give it some notice before adjournment. I hope at least we can work out in the committee an understanding that in the next session of Congress, when a perfected bill is introduced—and I shall be glad to introduce a perfected bill—we can then proceed with the consideration of the general problem of Federal aid to mental hospitals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 2711) to amend the Public Health Service Act, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 538, second session, to establish a Federal Bureau of Asylums for inspections of all institutions which obtain Federal grants of money, and which are caring for mental patients, was received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with this subject, I wish to point out that in the United States there are many sincere groups who are working on this matter because they are greatly disturbed over the very unfortunate, and in some instances disgraceful, conditions which exist in some of our mental hospitals.

So, Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD at this point certain communications which I have received from a gentleman by the name of Arthur J. Gross, who has been very active in this matter. Again I point out that he has proposals which I do not necessarily endorse, but he does have suggestions which I think are deserving of consideration by an appropriate committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 24, 1948.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with your suggestion when I talked with you at

the Capitol, I submit information to you on S. 2711.

The bill is loosely drawn with many parts open to criticism by opponents.

1. As (1) reads it would include veteran and other Government hospitals which do not come under the provisions of the National Mental Health Act.

2. Section 3, the Federal Bureau of Asylums should not be under the jurisdiction of a member of the Cabinet or joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives because the first part places the Bureau in a political plane and because of changes of Cabinet officers there would be uncertainties in the Bureau from time to time.

3. Section 3 is too restricted and possibly unconstitutional because of restriction of age and the barring of men within the medical and legal professions.

In my experience in legislative work, I have found that the simpler the bill is the better chance it has of enactment. S. 2711 gives opponents too many things to find fault with, thus defeating the purpose of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 22, 1948.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the courtesy extended to me on yesterday when I talked with you with reference to an amendment to the National Mental Health Act.

The purpose of the amendment is threefold, namely, to protect the United States Government and the taxpayers in unsupervised spending of money by private and State hospitals who may obtain money under the act.

As the act reads, nothing is done to reach the root of the trouble that is facing this country with regard to mental illness, and its treatment, except in research work. The Rockefeller Foundation and others interested in the above subject have spent large sums of money in the past without obtaining the results that are desired. Too much money was wasted in giving jobs to psychiatrists, students of psychiatry, social workers, clerks, and other administrative expenses, in carrying on the research work. At no time did those recipients do the most important thing, namely, consider the welfare of the inmate in the State hospital. No consideration was given to the fact that most victims of mental illness become such through social problems and not through physical conditions.

Real high-type psychoanalysts and psychiatrists recognize the above to be the fact. Recently in the United States religion has stepped into the picture and is doing some constructive work in giving the mentally ill some hope and peace of mind. A good example of this is the book written by Rabbi Joshua Liebman, of Boston—Peace of Mind—which was a best seller for months.

The third element is the State hospital employee. Unfortunately, due to the low-wage scale, treatment of employees, and lack of civil-service protection in most States, State and private mental hospitals have been unable to obtain the caliber of employee that is fitted for work in mental hospitals. Attendants in most cases are alcoholics; drifters, going from one hospital to another; homosexualists, or failures in life. Because of the type of work that is required of an attendant, very few high-type employees are attracted to the work of an attendant. In many State hospitals, superintendents of the old school are czars, running the institutions as their private enterprises, and with disregard for the old, antiquated laws pertain-

ing to commitment, constitutional rights of inmates and employees.

Many superintendents and psychiatrists in these hospitals have had no experience in the private practice of psychosomatic medicine and have been living on taxpayers ever since they came out of medical schools.

Public-spirited young doctors merely stay in a mental hospital as an intern or resident physician long enough to get some experience in psychiatry and then leave to go into private practice or go to another hospital and obtain a better position. Many of these young doctors get only between 3 months to a year of experience. The unscrupulous doctor—after such short period of training—assumes the role of an expert in mental diseases and preys on the public, who in the past 5 years have been overconscious about mental illness through the dangerous amount of publicity the country has been flooded with in books, magazine articles, plays, movies, and newspaper stories.

Inmates in State hospitals also are suffering because of the lack of high-grade experienced psychiatrists. Recently I found in one of the State hospitals where two young doctors, who were merely learning something about psychiatry, covering the male psychiatric service of over 1,000 patients. It is humanly impossible for doctors under such circumstances to do justice to their work and to the inmate. He cannot properly prepare his report on new admissions, which report is the basis for diagnosis and record of the inmate, which record he is judged by at the staff hearing, reports to relatives and testimony in court proceedings, involving the inmate and his property.

Let me also bring to your attention the fact that each State has its own insanity laws governing State hospitals. These laws vary, are old, antiquated, and inhuman. They, in many cases, have not been changed in over a hundred years in many respects. The laws in many instances have been lobbied through the State legislature by the medical profession and in its interest only, without regard for the victim of mental illness or illegal commitment, and utter disregard for the taxpayer, who foots the bills in supporting the State mental hospitals. I am working on a uniform Federal insanity law which will be ready for the next session of Congress.

For your information, I have sent copies of the amendment I have written and of which you have a copy, to about a hundred Members of Congress. I also am sending a letter, dated May 18, 1948, similar to the one you received, to labor and veterans' organizations, since there are thousands of members of organized labor in State and private mental hospitals. As for veterans, it is needless for me to inform you that there are thousands in State hospitals because of the lack of beds in veterans mental hospitals. These veterans are not getting the care and treatment in the State hospitals that they receive in veterans hospitals, or as intended by the Congress—and the Veterans' Administration. The State hospitals receive large sums of money for the care of the veterans in their hospitals, and do not give value for these payments. Even a meager investigation will disclose this.

May I also suggest that a congressional committee investigation be made of State and private mental hospitals. It will disclose half-raising evidence of mismanagement, cruelty, underfeeding, underclothing, and slave labor in the guise of occupational therapy.

I am writing you another letter as suggested by you with reference to S. 2711, Eightieth Congress, second session, the bill you filed on May 20, 1948.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 18, 1948.

A very grave problem faces this country, far more serious than is realized. The problem is the mental health of our people.

Due to the fact that there has been a dangerous amount of publicity concerning mental disease through books, magazine articles, plays, movies, and newspaper stories, the public has become over-conscious concerning their mental condition. They have been running to psychiatrists, psychoanalysts, and psychologists with their problems. Because mental diseases and psychiatry (the medical term for that part of the medical profession) is the infant of the medical profession and an inexact science, unscrupulous doctors, and psychologists have been bleeding the public with fees far beyond the value of their services. Because of old and antiquated State laws on insanity and commitments, thousands of people have been committed to State and private mental hospitals without trial and without due process of law, through the activities of unscrupulous doctors posing as mental experts, police, officials of cities and towns and relatives of the victims. Once in these hospitals, the victim loses every right guaranteed him by our Constitution. He, in most hospitals, is treated worse than a criminal in jail or in a penitentiary.

No one knows when he might be a victim himself. Over half the beds in hospitals in this country are occupied by mental patients, this is exclusive of Government hospitals.

The Congress of the United States in its effort to remedy the conditions enacted the National Mental Health law. This law will, no doubt, help the situation in the future. However, under the law, a blank check is given to State and private hospitals.

In order to protect the Government against waste of money and to protect the inmates in the mental hospitals, I have drawn an amendment to the act. I am enclosing herewith for your information a copy of the amendment which will be filed in the Senate and House of Representatives.

At a hearing before the appropriate congressional committees, I will appear with citizens and representatives of organizations who have for years been fighting the illegal commitment racket and conditions in the State and private hospitals.

Should you care to discuss this amendment with me, I will be more than happy to do so.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. GROSS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last of all I introduce, as a matter of courtesy to Mr. Gross, and for reference to the committee for such study and consideration and investigation as the committee in due course of time may wish to give to it, a bill which he proposes, dealing with a similar subject, but in many respects different from the bill which the other group asked me to introduce on May 10, and which I have submitted in revised form today, as a revised bill. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce this bill on the same subject matter, for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2765) to amend the Public Health Service Act, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 538, second session, to provide for Federal inspection of institutions, State mental health authorities, and hospitals who obtain grants of money, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, some of us have been discussing the unfortunate situation into which we are getting in the consideration of legislation, and about which the Senator from Nebraska has frequently spoken. It seems that unavoidably the displaced persons bill will go over until next week. If debate on it is continued, as apparently it will be, it is not now possible to determine when final action will be had on this measure, especially in view of the fact that next week, after we take up the bill again, again, and again, and again, it may be displaced for the consideration of other proposed legislation.

With that thought in mind, and with the utmost desire to be cooperative, I wish to suggest now to the acting majority leader that he give serious consideration that when we take up this bill again, we proceed with it until action on it is finished, and that if necessary we have night sessions, and that all Members of the Senate be notified that that course will be necessary. It is not desirable; I do not want it; I do not like night sessions; but I do not see how they can be avoided.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. In view of his observations, let me say for the RECORD that, as he well knows, the conference report on the Bulwinkle bill is a privileged matter, and consideration of it could not be foreclosed when the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] asked that it be laid before the Senate. In order to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, as the Senator recalls, unanimous consent was had whereby the consideration of the conference report on the Bulwinkle bill will be delayed until Friday of this week.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico also knows, because of his long experience in the Senate, that prompt consideration of appropriation bills is, of course, most important as they come along.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I began my remarks with a statement which perhaps the Senator from Nebraska did not hear, inasmuch as he may have been engaged in conversation. I said that what I was saying was not critical at all—

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. HATCH. But I simply realize the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that. I was just reaching the point, after referring to the background, of not only commending the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his remarks but of commenting on how we may act on his suggestion in order to bring about what he has suggested.

Mr. President, the displacement of the displaced persons bill has been somewhat disconcerting to all of us. For the RECORD, I wish to call attention once again to the fact that tomorrow, Friday, when the Senate convenes, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the conference report on the so-called Bulwinkle bill will come before the Senate. The time assigned for the debate on it is from 12 o'clock to 3:30 p. m. At that time a vote will be taken.

In view of the fact that the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, to which I referred to a moment ago, is ready, and that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has attempted to have it considered at various times during the last 3 or 4 days, I feel that at that time it will be best, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, to have the Senate take up that bill and conclude action on it.

Then, for the benefit of the RECORD and the Senators now present, I wish to say that it is my intention to bring up the proposed legislation relative to the Second War Powers Act. I think that measure can be disposed of with very little debate.

If action on all those measures is concluded tomorrow, so that we may return to the displaced persons' bill before the Senate adjourns tomorrow, then we shall be back on the unfinished business.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I agree with his suggestion 100 percent. But in order that all Senators may have a chance, once again, to have measures on the Consent Calendar acted upon, I think that if it meets with the approval of the Senate, we shall have the Senate adjourn on Friday until Tuesday. That will give the Senate a morning hour on Tuesday, and will provide an opportunity for going back to the beginning of the calendar for the consideration of all bills on the calendar, so that if there are bills as to which there is agreement, they can be disposed of. The morning hour will be concluded at 1 o'clock on Tuesday, because during all of next week, as has already been announced, the Senate will meet at 11 a. m. and will continue until 6 p. m.

So, Mr. President, beginning with next Tuesday, June 1, the Senate will again return to the unfinished business, the displaced persons bill. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that at that time it should not be displaced until action on it is concluded. But the appropriation bills and conference reports, as the Senator well knows, are privileged, as was action on the veto message. I certainly agree with the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico. They are very timely.

With the announcement I have made for the RECORD, outlining the program for tomorrow and the proposed adjournment over until Tuesday, the morning hour, the calling of the calendar, and the resumption of the consideration of the displaced-persons bill at 1 o'clock, June 1, I think we have outlined the program for the immediate future as far as possible. I may say it is our intention

when the displaced-persons legislation is concluded to make the draft bill the unfinished business. Following that, we shall have to determine from day to day what legislation is to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The so-called displaced persons bill is still before the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to take the floor to discuss the pending bill or to bring up other matters, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, Friday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 20), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

Philip C. Jessup, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska. (Mr. Arend is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 20), 1948:

Mrs. Helen Jaeger to be postmaster at Independence, in the State of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of love, who came to this world not to be ministered unto, but to minister, help us to give our services wholly to Thee and our fellow men; help us to seek by understanding, rather than by striving, to promote concord and harmony among all conditions of men.

O God, grant that this erring, groping day, with its baffled ignorance and sin, with its oppression and misery, may soon vanish and cease to hide Thee behind its wicked works. Open our minds that we may feel the breath of the overcoming spirit of the Christ, who was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

We pray for all upon whom rest the business, political, and industrial life of our country; in all their ways may they acknowledge Thee. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.